California Journal

A MONTHLY DIGEST OF STATE GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

Tax Deadlock Appears Certain

Unemployment Frustrates State

Gambling Revenue Draws Support

California's Republican Party

Budget

Gas Tax

Assembly Speaker
Bob Moretti

Hügo

May 1971 in Review

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Editor's Note

The shape of this year's legislative session is emerging out of the dust of the bill introduction frenzy as the committees begin sending to the floor (or killing) the major pieces of legislation. In this issue, *California Journal* focuses attention on several of the legislative issues which will be important during the remainder of the session.

Missing from the list is reapportionment, which earlier in the year many expected to be an important factor in determining the outcome of other issues. But so far there has been none of the bitter wrangling between the two political parties over their definitions of a "fair reapportionment," and the impending intra-party struggles have thus far caused hardly a ripple.

This is probably just as well since, with tax reform tied to passage of the budget, and passage of the budget tied to educational finance and welfare and Medi-Cal reform, June should be as hot as May was mild in Sacramento. And it now looks like there will be plenty of time to deal with reapportionment after the expected August recess.

* * *

The complete index to *California Journal* for 1970 was finally mailed to $25 and $50 subscribers this month. The delay was due to a serious underestimation of the size of the job; we just didn't believe we had covered that many subjects. The index runs to six pages, four columns to a page, over 75 listings per column, for a total of nearly 2000 entries. The job burned out at least three dedicated staffers before Assistant to the Editor Shirley Biondi undertook the effort earlier this year. The system is now under control and the index for the first half of 1971 will be out on time in mid-July. Copies of the 1970 index are available to individual subscribers for $5.00 each.

* * *

From time to time someone in state government writes an article for the *Journal*. Needless to say, we make a special effort in editing such a piece to be sure it does not reflect a partisan or institutional bias; we do not publish such articles until we are satisfied that they meet the standards of objectivity and factual accuracy our readers expect of the *Journal*.

An example in this issue is the piece on compulsory arbitration for public safety employees which was written for us by Doug Fowler. Fowler is currently Minority Consultant to the Assembly Ways and Means Committee and was Administrative Assistant to Assemblyman George Milias before Milias left the Assembly. Milias was a key figure in the development of public employee relations legislation, and, as his assistant, Fowler is very familiar with the subject.

* * *

We would like to invite your assistance in helping to make *California Journal* known to more potential subscribers. This month we will send a complimentary copy of the *Journal* to friends of our subscribers whom they feel might be interested in subscribing. Just send us a note with your name and address and the name and address of a friend or two who might find the *Journal* valuable.

California Journal

1108 O Street, Sacramento, California 95814
916/444-2840

EDITOR
Thomas R. Hoeber

ASSOCIATE EDITOR
Jerome Evans

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS
Judson Clark, William Geyer

CONTRIBUTORS
Jeffrey Davis, Thomas Jesse Goff Jr., Ann B. Jenkins, Michael Wenstrom

Washington Correspondent: Lou Cannon
Counsel: Conrad Klein
Assistant to the Editor: Shirley Biondi
Subscription Manager: Gay Clark

California Journal/Information Service
Quick Query Service
G. L. Sherwood, Director
916/444-0329

Southern California Representative
Robert Ramsay
750 S. Golden West Avenue
Arcadia, California 91006
213/446-8316 (Evenings)

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Eugene C. Lee Chairman	Director, Institute of Governmental Studies Professor of Political Science Univ. of California, Berkeley
Houston Flournoy	Controller, State of California
Richard W. Gable	Chairman, Department of Political Science Associate Director, Institute of Governmental Affairs Univ. of California, Davis
Carma R. Leigh	State Librarian of California
Rus Walton	Writer
John Whelan	Professor of Law Univ. of California, Davis
Alan J. Wyner	Professor of Political Science Univ. of Calif., Santa Barbara

The interpretation and analysis of people and events in *California Journal* are not necessarily those of members of the Advisory Committee; they are not responsible for any articles, signed or unsigned, which appear in its pages.

May, 1971 Volume II, Number 5

Copyright 1971 by California Journal, 1108 "O" Street, Sacramento, California 95814; Judson Clark, President; Thomas R. Hoeber, Vice President; Jerome Evans, Treasurer; William Geyer, Secretary. Rates are based on membership of clients and will be furnished on request. Second class postage paid at Sacramento, California.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Contents: May In Review

Moretti Says Legislature Provides the Leadership this Year, Not the Governor 128

Claiming Assembly leadership in such issues as tax reform, environmental protection and school finance, Assembly Speaker Bob Moretti charges the Governor with being more convincing to the public than to Democratic legislators.

Tax Battle Heads Toward Second Legislative-Administrative Deadlock 130

Democrats push a large tax reform package as the Governor indicates he will settle for withholding in the face of an inescapable state finance crisis in September.

Legislative Committees Add to Reagan's Budget 133

The Democratic-controlled fiscal committees in each house are pushing hard for state salary increases, more school funds and other state spending which will put Reagan's already unbalanced budget further into the red.

Continuing Unemployment Frustrates State Officials 134

As the unemployment rate rose to 7.4 percent, legislative and administrative officials claimed that there is little the state itself can do to reverse the trend.

Legislature Is Reluctant to Gamble 136

Despite the possibility of more state revenue and indications of increased public receptivity, the state's legislators appear reluctant to lead a drive this year for additional legalized gambling.

California's Republican Party: Cal Plan and Coexistence 140

The organization and the strategy which brought the Republicans to control of the Legislature in 1969 and which now must be put back in order after last year's losses.

Republican State Chairman Livermore Assesses His Party's Position and Prospects 142

Following 1970's setback for the Republicans' Cal Plan, state chairman Putnam Livermore discusses his efforts to try to put it all together again.

Policemen and Firemen Seek Binding Arbitration 147

Unhappy with their present negotiating position and threatening more strikes, policemen and firemen seek legislation requiring binding arbitration.

Proponents Divided on Transit Financing 144

This year's initial effort to gain financing for public transit has focused upon a gasoline sales tax, but citizens' groups are also preparing for another run at the highway fund.

Newsbriefs 138
People in the News 149
California Calendar 149
Voting Record 150
State Government Reports 148

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INTERVIEW

Moretti Says Legislature Provides Leadership This Year, Governor Does Not

Bob Moretti was first elected to the Assembly in 1964 and rose rapidly, becoming chairman of the Finance and Insurance Committee in his freshman year and serving in that capacity until he became chairman of the Governmental Organization Committee in 1969. He was elected Speaker in January of this year. This interview was conducted in Moretti's capitol office May 21st.

California Journal: Former Assembly Speaker Jess Unruh said in a recent article that the Governor continues to hold the initiative on most state issues because as yet no strong leader has emerged in the Legislature. How do you react to that?

Speaker Bob Moretti: I obviously don't agree with it at all. We happen to be trying something different around here this year, and it's telling the truth—telling it like it is. We know that things we say from time to time are going to be unpopular, but we made a determination at the outset that we were going to try to stick to the truth and defend things that might be unpopular if that's what the facts call for—to tell it like it is more than anybody else has ever done before.

We work more on a team basis rather than a personality basis up here this year. I have confidence in the various chairmen I have appointed, and confidence in their ability to make good decisions. I do not intend to inject myself into every issue and every committee's work.

As a result, things might be different than they have been in the past, but we think that the differences are healthy differences.

Journal: Do you think that this will enable the Legislature to take the initiative on key issues?

Moretti: It's not only going to be able to, it is. We've taken the initiative in various fields already. Take tax reform, for example. We have the only major tax reform proposal before the Legislature, as introduced by Assemblyman Gonsalves and myself. It offers the most significant property tax relief ever suggested in this state. It balances what is an inequitable and unfair tax system. It places more of the burden on big business in this state and closes many of the loopholes that exist.

In the environmental area the same thing is true. The only really significant bill dealing with the salvation of the California coastline was introduced by Assemblyman Sieroty, Dunlap, and myself. It is, I think, very tough but at the same time possible, and I think it may well reach the Governor's desk this year. If it does, I think he will have no alternative but to sign it, in spite of the opposition of the oil companies and the utilities and some other people of whom he is so fond.

In the area of school finance we are making concrete efforts to pool our brain power and to work out a possible solution and compromise. We have, in fact, included nearly a quarter billion dollars in our tax bill for state contributions to local school districts.

I think no matter what area you look in you will find, in fact, that the Legislature has taken the initiative and has offered more significant proposals. The Governor speaks an awful lot but acts very little, and I think this is indicative of his administration, not only this year but in all the years he has been Governor.

Journal: After his May 11th meeting with the legislative leadership, the Governor reported the legislative leaders had said to him that they were unwilling to deal with withholding as a separate tax issue. If your program bogs down, will you reconsider your position?

Moretti: That is what we said. It is also the Governor's position. His quote in his press conference of January 19th said he thought that withholding should be included in a tax reform program. We intend to support that position of his, and, as a matter of fact, that is how we are offering it. If we allow withholding to go on its own, the Governor and his people will kill the closing of the oil depletion loophole and other loopholes we feel must be closed to give people in this state a fair shake on taxation. The fact is that he is going to have to accept reform and accept the closing of loopholes that he would like to keep open, if he wants withholding. It's certainly going to be the position that we maintain for as long as we are discussing this issue. I think that that is not only my position, it is Senator Mills' position.

Journal: The budget seems to be, on the Assembly side anyway, about two weeks ahead of last year. Does this mean simply that you're going to be into a deadlock two weeks earlier?

Moretti: That depends entirely on how honest the Governor is willing to be. As I have repeatedly said, everyone in this building knows that we need a revenue increase this year, including the Governor.

What he is going to do in the next month, probably, is say to the people, "Gosh, I really tried for you. You know I'm Ronnie good guy, and I did what I could to prevent this odious thing from happening." But "that damn Legislature" or "that damn federal government" or "the state employees", or whatever he chooses to make the scapegoat for this issue, will be blamed for the tax increase, when everybody has known all along that it's absolutely necessary in order to avoid bankruptcy for this state.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

So he'll be there but he'll couch it in his own terms, and, once again, attempt to appear as the martyr for the people. One of these days they're going to understand he's their enemy.

Journal: Well, you're not going to be able to move either the budget or the tax bill to the Governor to place that issue before him until you've reached agreement in the Legislature. How do you see the deadlock being broken?

Moretti: Well, the Democratic members of this house have ardently worked to fulfill their obligations.

Hugo

They worked long and hard in the Ways and Means Committee, completed their subcommittee hearings, and in fact moved a very, very reasonable budget document to the floor and are doing the same with regard to tax reform. Now if the Republicans want to kill the budget or they want to kill tax reform, that's their business. But we have done what we came here to do. If they want to join us in accomplishing something, we welcome them with open arms. I hope that's the attitude that the Republican legislators take in spite of whatever the Governor's position is.

Journal: Two months ago, Willie Brown indicated to us at least a hope that there may be some cooperation with the Senate with respect both to the budget and the tax packages. There seems to be little evidence of that now, except that you're both going in roughly the same direction.

Moretti: I don't think that's true. I think there definitely has been more communication and more agreement with regard to the budget this year than there ever has been before. As a matter of fact, Assemblyman Brown and Senator Collier have been in nearly daily contact with regard to the budget. I think that there will be fewer problems when we get to conference committee this year than there ever have been before. With regard to the tax proposal, the Senate is attempting to bring one forth. I know they will. What differences will or will not exist between their plan and ours I simply cannot tell you at this point—it would be purely conjecture because they have not put it into bill form yet.

Journal: On the subject of welfare, the Governor recently indicated that you had not had benefit personally of a briefing from his staff and therefore could be excused, presumably, for some of your opposition to his plan.

Moretti: Let me tell you that I have had that briefing, as a matter of fact right here in this office. I attempted to listen as carefully and absorb as much as possible. I think that my original feelings were very accurate. The Governor is attempting again to sell rhetoric and to sell form rather than substance. This is his entire approach. Substance is meaningless as far as he is concerned. All he is going to do is to stop things or pick out a scapegoat and blame that scapegoat for whatever ills exist in the state.

He refuses to talk about unemployment because he knows that is the most serious problem confronting this state, that he has offered nothing and has supported nothing to help cure that problem.

Journal: Is the Assembly talking about an unemployment bill?

Moretti: If you really want to resolve the welfare problem the way you do it is with jobs. Senator Tunney and I have together introduced a package that will produce 100,000 jobs here in California. And if, in fact, the Governor is concerned about unemployment and is concerned about welfare, then he's going to support that program.

We will have a package emerging very shortly with regard to work opportunities that I hope he will support. But, you see, as long as he has the fixation, this obsession, of attempting to balance the state budget at the cost to local government, he is not going to be in a position to support anything positive because all he is trying to do is stop things where they stand. His efforts to balance the state budget are only going to cause misery at the local level.

Journal: Should your tax program and other alternatives bog down, which seems at this moment quite likely, the cities are going to come out this year again with little or no gain. What will be the consequences for city government in this state?

Moretti: Well, I don't believe that the cities will come out with no gain this year. When I spoke to them I told them that I would support several of the items that they were interested in for revenue purposes and I intend to do just that. So I think that there is a very reasonable possibility we will give them some help this year. They have a particularly acute problem since nearly every revenue-help package, whether it be from the state government or the federal government, basically is aimed at the school districts and the counties rather than at the cities. We recognize the need to give them some assistance, and I think we will.

Journal: You said, in regard to the Governor's welfare program, that he ought to be more interested in providing jobs, but what is your position at this point on the Governor's program itself?

Moretti: There are certain portions of the Governor's program that I have told him and have said publicly that I would support. I'm glad that after two years of recommendations by the Assembly Welfare Committee, he has agreed to the categorization of the aged, blind, and disabled, into a pension-type program.

The Governor, although he likes to make out as though he is the only good soul in opposition to welfare fraud, will receive any kind of cooperation from us to strengthen the fraud provisions of the Welfare Code.

Beyond that, his program really doesn't do much. He is attempting to sell the people of California a bag of hot air, and an awful lot of them may well have bought it because they don't know the details. They don't understand that what he is saying just isn't real and, as a matter of fact, does not save the kind of money he's talking about.

At the outset we contended that the Governor was forcing state costs back on the local government. He denied that vehemently. But last week the bills underwent substantial change to protect the counties from

(Continued on page 132)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tax Battle Heads Toward Second Legislative-Administrative Deadlock

Although it was evident long before the 1971 session began that taxes would be one of the central issues this year, it has only been in the past month that the Governor and the Legislature have begun to move in this area. Despite echoing campaign promises of tax reform and repeated warning from Legislative Analyst A. Alan Post and others that a state tax increase is inevitable, there were, until early May, few signs of the battle to come.

In part, this was because the Governor, who lacks a majority this session in either house, chose not to lead off with a major administration-backed tax program. Instead, he allowed the Democrats to take the initiative and waited to see what the Assembly and the Senate would produce. As he later explained it, he believed it was time to "wait for a little initiative on the part of the people upstairs. After all I'm not the Legislature, I'm the Executive, and I don't think there's been any secret about where we stand on this."

Although several tax bills (some of which were merely "spot" bills temporarily without substance) were introduced during the early months of the session, the only major proposal came from the Assembly Democrats in the form of a series of bills coauthored by Joe A. Gonsalves, the new chairman of the Revenue and Taxation Committee, and Speaker Bob Moretti.

Gonsalves-Moretti Package

As introduced, the Gonsalves-Moretti tax package (AB 1215-1219, ACA 44) provided for tax increases of $1.40 billion and local tax relief of $1.38 billion in 1971-72, with both figures growing to $2.1 billion by 1973-74. This made it easily the most ambitious tax proposal to be introduced in recent years.

The original proposal called for a complete exemption of all owner-occupied houses (but excluding the land) from property taxes, permitting an initial reduction in local taxes of over $1 billion. Renters were to benefit proportionately. Other major provisions in the original (and present) bills: an increase of $242 million in state support for the public schools; state assumption of the full cost of administering state mandated welfare programs, and an increase in the business inventory tax exemption to 50 percent in 1972.

To pay for this local property tax relief, the Gonsalves-Moretti proposal calls for a one-cent increase in the state sales tax; the adoption of withholding and certain rate increases for personal income taxes; increases in insurance, inheritance and automobile taxes; a 0.5 percent increase in the bank and corporation tax; and a reduction in the oil depletion allowances.

First Amendments

In order to win a majority vote for passage out of the Assembly Revenue and Taxation Committee, which was the first test for the package, the authors had to accept three important amendments. In place of the total property tax exemption for owner occupied houses, the present homeowner's exemption is to be raised from $750 to $4,000 (meaning that houses of up to $16,000 in value, including the land, and assessed at 25 percent, would be exempt).

A second amendment establishes a five percent minimum income tax on any amount of "preferential treatment" income (such as capital gains and depreciation funds) above $30,000. The other change reduces the qualifying age for the senior citizen's tax relief benefits from 65 to 55 and increases the amount of income which can be earned without disqualification.

The amended bills now go to the Ways and Means Committee, where they are not expected to encounter any particular difficulty, inasmuch as the Democrats hold a 12-9 majority. When the bills reach the Assembly floor, however, they will face a much more serious test, for they will then require a two-thirds majority for passage to the Senate.

More Compromises Likely

As observed by Assemblyman William T. Bagley, who carried the Governor's unsuccessful tax program last year, it will take a number of additional compromises to obtain 54 votes in the Assembly. As a notably independent member of the Republican minority, Bagley probably holds one of the 11 or more Republican votes Democrats will seek to win. However, possibly as a measure of his lack of confidence in the Democrats' ability to secure the necessary votes, Bagley had already reintroduced the bills he carried last year and prepared an attempt to move them whenever he could get support from the Governor.

Kenneth F. Hall, Deputy Director of Finance for the Reagan Administration, conceded in testimony before the Revenue and Taxation Committee that the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Governor will have to compromise with the Democrats if there is to be any tax legislation this year. However, he also reported that the administration is opposed to most of the major elements of the Gonsalves-Moretti bills. This, coupled with the fact that in the past the Governor has evidenced a consistent unwillingness to bargain with Democratic legislators on important fiscal matters, makes the prospects for an early resolution of the issue exceedingly dim.

Blame the Democrats

In a statement in early May acknowledging that the state will run out of cash in September, Reagan made it clear that he would place the blame on the Democratic-controlled Legislature. Noting that a bill, AB 184 (Bagley), to enact withholding effective July 1st had been introduced January 19th, but had subsequently been ignored, he charged the Assembly Democratic leadership with being "willing to play fast and loose with the fiscal integrity of this state for purely partisan advantage." Although the Governor has only recently indicated a willingness to adopt withholding as a separate measure and has yet to state exactly how he thinks the first year's windfall should be handled, he apparently is willing to try to make the Democrats the scapegoats for next fall's cash crisis.

At this point, Assembly Democrats seem ready to risk taking the blame as the price for getting some tax reform and a tax increase for education and state employee salaries. In a press conference May 11th, following a meeting between the Governor and legislative leaders, Reagan said that he favored but the Legislators opposed dealing separately with withholding, rather than as part of a tax reform package. Assembly Speaker Bob Moretti later confirmed his opposition to a separation of the issues but argued that this was consistent with the Governor's position, as he had stated it ever since announcing his support for withholding.

On May 24th the Democratic majority on the Revenue and Taxation Committee did in fact refuse to pass out AB 184, Bagley's withholding bill. Bagley offered to hold his bill on the floor, if it gets that far, pending action on the Gonsalves-Moretti bills, and warned that the state must at least have withholding if nothing else succeeds. Gonsalves refused to concede the point, but it was noted that another withholding bill, this one carried by a Democrat, will come before the same committee on June 7th.

Senate Impasse

In early March the Senate named a bipartisan, 12-member committee to draft a comprehensive tax reform program which could be supported by both parties. After half-a-dozen meetings the committee remained seriously divided on several key issues and was forced to abandon its effort. In the wake of that failure, two Democratic bills and one Republican bill were introduced (taking over three "spot" bills) at the end of May. The Democratic authors are George R. Moscone, Majority Floor Leader, and Randolph Collier, Senate Finance Committee chairman. The Republican bill is being carried by Robert J. Lagomarsino.

Earlier in the month Governor Reagan had indicated through Finance Director Verne Orr that he would not push a proposal of his own if the Senate committee could produce a bipartisan package. When it became evident that the Senate Republicans and Democrats would not be able to agree, Reagan announced that he would support the Lagomarsino bill in the Senate and that Bagley would again carry his proposals in the Assembly. Although the bills are not in print as of this writing, it is apparent that they will be essentially the same as the Governor's 1970 program, even to the point of bearing the same numbers in the Assembly, AB 1000 and AB 1001, thanks to Bagley's foresight. The one likely change from 1970 is to make the homeowner's exemption favor less expensive homes.

Although the Governor now has a program of his own, it is doubtful that he will be able to do much with it. There is no reason to believe that he will be able to get the Democratic votes necessary to move his bills out of the Revenue and Taxation Committees. More likely, the Governor will bide his time, awaiting a possible Senate-Assembly impasse on tax legislation.

Tax Increase Likely

Despite Governor Reagan's continued opposition to a tax increase (apart from the withholding windfall), Assembly Speaker Moretti has predicted an increase of no less than $250 million, and Senate Finance Committee Chairman Randolph Collier has said he expects an increase of from $500 million to $1 billion. In late April, Senate Republican Caucus Leader John Harmer was reported as conceding the necessity of "some type of tax increase" this year, but he subsequently withdrew from that position. In early May, Harmer and Republican Minority Leader Fred W. Marler Jr. issued a statement denying that a tax increase was inevitable. These remarks were quickly lost, however, when Senator Clair W. Burgener, a member of the Senate Finance Committee, remarked to the press that he and many of his Republican colleagues would probably support a tax increase of $100 million to $200 million if some welfare reform could also be approved.

Cities Want New Revenue

Apart from the Governor, one of the chief opponents of the Gonsalves-Moretti bills is the League of California Cities. According to league representatives, the present bills do nothing to aid the hard-pressed cities whose fiscal problems, they say, surpass those of county government and the public schools. At the minimum the cities want one or more of the following: increases in the motor vehicle and liquor licenses fees, authority to tax liquor by the drink ("tippler's tax"), elimination of the one percent utility use tax exemption, and extension of the property transfer tax. But as long-run aid to produce state revenues equivalent to expenditure requirements, the cities want either authority to levy an income tax or, failing that, an increase in sales tax revenues or extension of the utility users tax authority to general law as well as charter cities.

At the moment the cities appear to be in a good bargaining position, particularly if they obtain support from the Governor. However, there is no way to predict the outcome of the inevitable deadlock over taxes, the budget, school aid, and welfare which is now developing. It may be that nothing other than withholding, and perhaps not even that, will come out of the Assembly-Senate-Administration compromises yet to be written.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MORETTI *(Continued from page 129)*

that happening, as we and the counties knew all along would have been the result of his original proposal.

Beyond that the Legislature, no matter what the Governor wants, is not going to pass legislation that is going to further hurt those who already have nothing, who have no savings, who have no income, who have none of the things in life that you and I enjoy. I understand that it's a popular whipping boy, but the Legislature is not going to turn its back on the children, the aged, the blind and the disabled in this state.

Journal: On the coastline issue, you said earlier you saw that as the prime environmental issue of the session. Last year the coastline preservation measure faced substantial opposition in the Senate and died there. How do you see that changing this year?

Moretti: Well, I'm hopeful that my authorship of that legislation will significantly increase its possibility. I have not heretofore been involved deeply with regard to environmental legislation, but I am tremendously concerned about it, and as a result this year I joined with Assemblymen Sieroty and Dunlap with regard to the coastline issue, in the hopes that I could add some weight to the possibility of that package passing. I think some coastline legislation will come out of both houses this year. If, in fact, my involvement helps it, then it will have been worthwhile.

Journal: Do you see any sign that the attitude of the Senate is changing on the coastline issue?

Moretti: Well, I think the attitude of the Senate generally is changing, and so I'm hopeful that will carry down through the issues. I think that Jim Mills is very interested in it and will do whatever possible to help us see that something occurs this session.

Journal: At the start of the 1971 session everyone thought reapportionment was going to be a dominant factor, but at this point that doesn't appear to be the case. Why is that?

Moretti: If you will check my statements, you will find that I said that it would not be a dominant feature of this session. I think that's proving to be true. The reapportionment is going to take longer this year than it ever has before simply because this is the first time that the one-man, one-vote ruling will be operative following a decennial census. As a result, the data gathering has taken far longer than it ever has before simply because the federal government did not have those figures to release to us. We are in the process now of bringing to a close the preparation of that information. Once that's done we will be able to proceed with the reapportionment.

Journal: Does that mean you won't get to reapportionment within the regular time-span of this session?

Moretti: We will do it this session, the only thing that I can't tell specifically is at what point in this session. We have to coordinate our activities with the Senate so that we can move with regard to reapportionment in about the same time period, and as soon as both houses are ready and both parties have the information they deem necessary, we will move.

Journal: That sounds very much like August or September.

Moretti: That's possible.

Committee Assignment Changes

Following is a complete list of changes in Assembly and Senate Committee assignments since the Legislative Roster was printed in the January issue. (Additional copies of the roster are still available for $0.10 each plus $0.10 per order for postage and handling.)

Senate

- Harmer replaced Richardson on the Elections and Reapportionment Committee and as vice-chairman of the committee.
- Petris filled the vacancy on the Health and Welfare Committee.
- Richardson replaced Harmer on the Industrial Relations Committee.
- Gregorio filled the vacancy on the Natural Resources and Wildlife Committee.
- Mills filled the vacancy on the Transportation Committee.
- The membership of the Water Resources Committee was increased from seven to nine. Way was added to the committee and one position was left vacant.

Assembly

- Vasconcellos was added to the Environmental Quality Committee.
- Stull left the Government Administration Committee, leaving a vacancy.
- Arnett left the Retirement Committee, leaving a vacancy.
- Arnett replaced Ketchum on the Welfare Committee.

Property Taxes Continue to Rise

Average property tax rates rose last year by $1.00 or more in 12 of California's counties, according to a recent report by the State Board of Equalization. Statewide, the average increase was $.93, up from $9.92 in 1969-70 to $10.85 in 1970-71. In only five counties (Lake, Lassen, Mariposa, Placer and Sierra) did the average rate fall.

Net taxable assessed valuation increased by $3 billion in the same period, slightly less than the average increase of $3.2 billion for the five preceding years. Total taxable assessed valuation reached $55.6 billion for 1970-71, including $1.9 billion in homeowners' exemptions, and $1.0 billion in business inventory exemptions, for which the tax loss is made up from state payments.

	1969-70	1970-71
Net taxable assessed value (billions)	$ 49.7	$52.7
Average tax rate, all purposes	9.92	10.85
Average tax rate for:		
Cities	1.09	1.09
Counties*	2.88	3.47
Schools	5.35	5.64
Other districts	.60	.65

*Includes City and County of San Francisco
Source: State Board of Equalization

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Legislative Committees Add to Reagan Budget

Listening to the Senate Finance Committee approve one augmentation after another to the Governor's already unbalanced $6.7 billion budget, Legislative Analyst A. Alan Post was moved to observe that the committee was creating "close to $700 million worth of problems." "Before we're through" snapped Randolph Collier, the committee's chairman, "its going to hit a billion."

As the fiscal committee in each house wound up its subcommittee hearings on the 1971-72 budget and prepared its version of the budget bill for passage to the floor, the message was unmistakable. The Democratic leadership is convinced that it can and must send back to the Governor a budget which meets what it believes to be the essential needs of the state, and if that takes a tax increase, as the Democrats believe it will, then that's what it will be.

The Assembly version of the budget bill, which was approved by the Ways and Means Committee May 12th and sent to the Assembly floor, provides for $7 billion in expenditures, $274 million more than the Governor originally proposed. The principal increases approved by the Assembly committee include $116 million for civil service and higher education pay raises, $115 million to offset budget balancing transfers from specially earmarked funds which the committee rejected, $8 million for local mental health programs, $13.5 million for the University of California, $21.5 million for the state colleges, $3.4 million for the community colleges, $2.8 million in state scholarship funds, $33.7 million in higher education capital outlay, $2 million in subventions for children's centers and preschool education, and $1.8 million for crippled children's care.

The Assembly budget bill is out of balance — in excess of projected revenues — by at least $500 million. This amount includes $220 million in restored welfare fund reductions by which the Governor's original budget was technically balanced, plus the $318 million in costs added by committee action. Ways and Means Chairman Willie L. Brown acknowledged that the Assembly bill cannot stand by itself but claimed that it was "just as balanced" as Reagan's proposal by virtue of the fact that the additional cost is covered by $348 million in funds which are ordinarily held back as necessary working capital.

As of May 28th, the Senate Finance Committee had added $472 million to the Governor's original budget, including such items as $145.8 million for Medi-Cal, $62.8 million for civil service and $50 million for UC and state college salary increases, $9.9 million for UC support, $2.7 million for the state colleges, $100 million in public school subventions, $6.2 million for mental hygiene, and $1.8 million for crippled children's services. These increases bring the budget total to approximately $7.3 million, not including potential additional spending of $220 million for welfare, depending on actual caseloads.

The action of the Senate committee also puts the budget out of balance, in this case by from $470 million to $690 million, at the minimum. Collier, who in past years has unblinkingly voted across-the-board cuts of 15 percent to balance the budget, seems to be as unconcerned as Brown, but he has not yet won approval from a majority on his committee. One Democrat, John W. Holmdahl, has said that he will not vote for a budget which requires the kind of tax increase that the Finance Committee augentations would now necessitate. As he holds the seventh Democratic vote which is needed to get the bill out of committee, Holmdahl is in a rather strong bargaining position. As a consequence, Collier has conceded that the committee has not yet completed its work.

In any case, however, it is doubtful that the Democratic leaders in either house can or want to move the budget bill off the floor of each house until they have come to some agreement on a tax program and can move both parts together. It would be pointless for them, even if they had the necessary Republican votes, to send a budget bill to the Governor without the supporting revenue sources, giving him justification to "blue pencil" the expenditures for education, salaries and other purposes not included in his original proposal.

The leaders of both houses must also try to reach agreement on the matter of an increase in school funds. A majority in each house, including a number of Republicans, appears committed to some increase this year, but there is no evident agreement as to what it will be. The tax bills backed by the Assembly Democratic leadership now provide $242 million in new school funds. State Superintendent Wilson Riles is pushing hard for additional aid totaling nearly $400 million, together with a statewide property tax, and he seems to have considerable support for that increase. Senator Collier, who has let it be known that he would like to become recognized as a benefactor of schools as well as highways, has said he may hold out for as much as $500 million.

Whatever the amount is, that increase, together with the budget bill, will require a sizeable tax increase. Thus, legislative attention is likely to shift in the first few weeks in June from spending questions to revenue questions, as the leadership in the Assembly and Senate tries to put together a revenue package which will satisfy needs for property tax relief and increased state spending, and which will attract enough Republican support to provide the necessary two-thirds majority for approval.

Revenues Declining

Complicating the problem for the Legislature as well as the Governor is the fact that current state revenues are reported to be falling below earlier estimates by $66.7 million. This means that the projections for the budget year must be lowered by as much as $150 million.

Customarily the administration makes public its new revenue forecast for the coming fiscal year in late May or early June. There is every reason to believe that the new figures will not only force the Governor to abandon his position in opposition to a tax increase but may also advance by one month the state's coming cash crisis.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Continuing Unemployment Frustrates State

In April of this year the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate in California hit 7.4 percent, represesenting some 595,000 people who were out looking for work but were unable to find any. This is now the worst period of unemployment in this state in the last 20 years.

The depressed condition of the state's economy did more than simply reflect the national picture; California was significantly worse off. The State's unemployment rate of 7.4 percent can be compared to a rate of 6.1 percent in the country as a whole. While some of this disparity can be explained in terms of California's high defense and aerospace unemployment, the significant fact is that almost all sectors of California's economy showed either declines or less than normal advances compared with a year ago.

Manufacturing Loss

Total civilian employment in California actually declined by 41,000 people between April of 1970 and April of 1971. According to the Department of Human Resources Development (HRD), this decline can be attributed largely to a sharp decline in the manufacturing sector of the economy last fall, with no subsequent recovery. Between April of 1970 and April of this year, employment was down in this sector of the economy by 133,000 workers. Generally, manufacturing can be expected to enjoy a seasonal upturn between the months of February and April, but in 1971 an overall decline of 6,000 workers was experienced during that period. While HRD attributes the leading role in this decline to the aerospace manufacturing industries, which have reached their lowest point since late 1958, it noted that other manufacturing activities were also down from a year ago.

Other sectors of the economy also showed net declines from a year ago, although not of the same magnitude. The construction, agriculture and mineral extraction industries all suffered job losses, while transportation and utilities registered a very modest increase of 16,000 workers over the year-long period.

The services industries increased by 40,000 workers over the same period of time, but this growth was smaller than had been experienced in 1970. The same was essentially true of the wholesale and retail trade segments of the economy, which showed an increase of 24,000 since last April. Public employment in California, which now accounts for 1,468,000 jobs, or 18 percent of civilian employment, increased by 35,000 over the past year.

Crisis Level

The picture presented by these figures suggests an economy that is seriously depressed. Moreover, this depression is not isolated in any particular geographical area. Of the state's 13 major market areas, 11 are experiencing unemployment levels above the "crisis level" of six percent, established by the federal government.

Yet even these figures, as high as they are, fail to reflect the full magnitude of the problem, for they reflect only those who are registered with the HRD Employment Service as being out-of-work and looking for employment. They do not reflect those who have used up their unemployment insurance benefits and then did not re-register, or those who have so completely given up hope that they have stopped looking for work altogether, or many of those who work so intermittently, and for such a low salary, that they are unable to support themselves or their families even at the poverty level.

While all agencies involved in giving assistance to the unemployed concede the existence of this group of uncounted and underemployed, no one seems able to give a clear statement as to the dimensions of the problem or the number of people involved. What is clear, however, is that the sheer number of people who are out of work in California presents state officials with administrative and budgeting pressures of a very grave nature, and about which they seem to be able to do very little.

Joint Legislative Committee Report

In 1968 the Legislature agreed to set up a Joint Legislative Committee on Economic Conversion to determine what the state might do to offset the then evident decline in federal aerospace spending and to prepare for the potentially sharp decline in defense industry spending to follow the end of the war in Vietnam. One of the principal objectives of the committee was to initiate development of a "comprehensive plan for economic conversion in California."

Unemployment Rates for Major Areas

Labor Market Area	April 1970	April 1971
Los Angeles-Long Beach	5.2%	7.7%
San Francisco-Oakland	4.6	5.9
Anaheim-Santa Ana-Garden Grove	5.2	8.0
San Diego	5.0	6.7
San Jose	4.9	6.4
San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario	5.5	7.2
Sacramento	5.1	6.2
Fresno	6.1	6.7
Bakersfield	5.3	5.8
Stockton	7.8	8.1
Oxnard-Ventura	5.8	8.3
Santa Barbara	4.7	6.2
Vallejo-Napa	5.0	6.1

Source: Dept. of Human Resources Development

Somewhat ironically, the committee, according to an interim report issued this spring, has been unsuccessful in doing so because it could not obtain federal funding for the study. The federal government, it said, had created California's dependency upon the "defense-aerospace" industry and is now threatening to eliminate much of that industry, but is unwilling to help California through the withdrawal period.

The committee report places the blame for what it terms the "defense-aerospace crisis" on two factors: (1) a Johnson administration decision to cut back research, development and production of advanced weapons systems to provide funds for conventional armament, and (2) congressional cutbacks in funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Both actions, says the committee, had their greatest impact in California.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

After first blaming "the present crisis and any future crisis" on the executive branch of the federal government, the committee report goes on to spread the blame to: the management structure within the defense-aerospace industry for its inability to part company with the Defense Department; congress for failing to pass economic conversion legislation which would require conversion planning by government and industry; various federal agencies for failing to take the initiative for economic conversion planning on their own; and Governor Reagan for playing down the problem.

Just over a year ago the chairman of the joint committee, Assemblyman John L. Burton, charged, "The California economy in general, and aerospace industry in particular . . . is in a full-blown recesssion, and the administrations in both Washington and Sacramento are grossly understating the crisis. Furthermore, there is no help or prospects of help, at the present time, for those left jobless because of failure to plan for this crisis." A year later, in presenting the committtee's report, Burton said, "The major proponents of high levels of defense spending, the defense contractors and the federal government, have little or no interest in economic conversion."

Long-Run Problem

The long-run problem, "the real conversion issue," says the committee, "is altering California's industrial mix, which would permit future growth to be more evenly balanced." Unfortunately, nowhere in the committee's report is there a suggestion as to how that might be accompilshed, except by a "comprehensive plan of conversion." The report does not say what it means by economic conversion planning and how such planning would be applied to alter the present economic structure within this state.

In its failure so far to make a real contribution toward reducing unemployment, the committee reflects the sense of helplessness and frustration which seems to dominate the thinking of nearly all state and local officials in this regard. They know that the jobless rate has reached a crisis level and they know that this is having a costly impact on welfare spending, tax revenues, and other aspects of public life. But beyond pressing for increases in unemployment benefits and modification of other public and private benefit programs, they don't seem to know what to do. It is, these officials say, a federal problem: only the federal government, they believe, can have a significant impact on the economic health of the state.

State Stymied

Governor Reagan, in discussing his welfare program and the unemployment problem generally, has expressed his concern and his desire to find a remedy. But his administration has been continually frustrated in its efforts to place workers in private employment and apparently has found it unexpectedly difficult to create public employment opportunities as well. Even his public service employment program for welfare recipients, which was given a prominent place earlier in the year in his welfare reform program, has failed so far to get off the ground.

Unfortunately for those who are out of work, the tendency of the state and local government during a period of continued recession is to cut back on expenditures and thus on public employment opportunities. Caught between declining tax revenues and rising operating costs, state and local officials understandably seek ways to cut their spending. Because employee salaries are such a large part of governmental costs, this inevitably means a reduction in jobs.

The prospect of raising taxes to provide more public jobs is singularly unattractive to political leaders. As Reagan observed in a press conference May 11th, " . . . if revenues are down it means that more people are unemployed . . . and I don't see why the state should think that the automatic and easy answer . . . is to simply take more money away from those people who are already suffering because of this economic slump." Later in the same press conference he stated his opinion that "the business corner has been turned" and that "everyone knows when you come out of a slump of this kind, the last recovery is in the area of unemployment."

Distribution of California Civilian Employment by Major Industry Division, 1950-1970

	1950	1960	1970
Agriculture, forestry and fisheries	9%	6%	4%
Mineral extraction	1	1	*
Construction	7	6	5
Manufacturing	19	23	20
Transportation & utilities	8	6	6
Trade	23	21	21
Finance, insurance & real estate	4	5	5
Services	16	18	21
Government	13	15	18
TOTALS	100%	100%	100%

*Less than 0.5%

U.S. Senators Alan Cranston and John Tunney have called upon the President to release $10.9 billion in federal funds for everything from health services to highways to reclamation which they say has been appropriated by congress but frozen by the administration. They have also backed Senator Gaylord Nelson's bill, entitled the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 to make $1.75 billion available for public service jobs through June 30, 1973. Together with the release of other federal funds, the bill, which has passed the Senate and is now to be considered by the House, would produce up to 100,000 jobs in California according to its proponents.

President Nixon also has a measure, his Manpower Revenue Sharing Act, which is to establish a broad authorization for public service jobs in place of categorical programs. At this writing it appears that the two plans are headed for a collision and that neither is likely to emerge in time to significantly affect unemployment in the next three to six months.

Last year and the year before there was a great deal of talk about providing summer jobs for youth. Last year the planning started as early as February when Governor Reagan announced administration plans for "the most intensive and far-reaching Summer-Jobs-For-Youth campaign ever launched in California." This year there has been hardly a mention of summer jobs, except by the youths themselves who know that their prospects are the worst of any.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Betting Proposals

Legislature Is Reluctant to Gamble

New forms of legal gambling — touted earlier this year as partial answers to the state's deepening financial woes — aren't likely to be products of the 1971 Legislature. Both the Senate and the Assembly are moving slowly and cautiously on proposals to expand publicly sanctioned betting, but they appear to be a considerable distance from approving a specific measure.

Legislative reluctance to authorize legalized off-track betting, dog racing, jai alai, or a state lottery appears to stem from two basic concerns. First, despite indications of an apparent shift in voter sentiment toward support for legalized gambling (see the California Poll survey on next page), much uncertainty remains about the depth of these feelings and the political future of a politician who publicly advocates gambling. Second, it has been noted that those states which have enacted new forms of public gambling (in addition to horse racing) have had to overcome many technical problems and numerous federal laws designed to discourage lotteries and interstate pari-mutuel wagering.

Nevertheless, there appears to be increasing sentiment in favor of expanded gambling opportunities, and legislators who are interested in the revenue prospects seem to agree that this year's freeze on gambling legislation could very easily thaw as early as next year.

Attorney General Study

For this reason there is considerable interest in a forthcoming report to be issued by Attorney General Evelle J. Younger. Early in the session Younger announced that an 18-man task force of state law enforcement officials would take a "fresh look" at the law enforcement consequences of additional legalized gambling and report to him in time to aid him in commenting on the pending bills. In announcing the study the Attorney General observed that the committee could be expected to " . . . form a conclusion as to whether organized crime would make more strenuous efforts to move into California if these bills passed; or would (they) discourage further attempts to infiltrate."

Before the early session flurry of interest in legalized gambling had subsided, a total of six measures were introduced relating to legalized gambling. Three of the measures permit a state lottery for educational purposes. Among the other three, one establishes a special study commission on gambling, another authorizes dog racing, and the third legalizes pari-mutuel wagering on jai alai.

State Lottery

Proposals to create a state lottery for the support of education appear to have the widest support among legislators, who are attracted by the revenue gains New York has made. A recent study released by the Legislative Analyst summarizing revenues to other states from various lottery and gambling laws indicates that the State of New York obtained $25.8 million in net revenue for the 1969-70 fiscal year from its lottery. New Hampshire has had much less success with its lottery, but it is the New York example which proponents believe provides the best measure for California.

According to Article IV, Section 19(a) of the California Constitution, however, the Legislature has no power to authorize a lottery; a constitutional amendment must be submitted to the voters to gain approval of any lottery proposal the Legislature may favor. Thus there are two constitutional amendments, SCA 8 (Dymally) and ACA 64 (Ralph) as well as a bill, SB 91 (Dymally), to permit the Legislature to establish a lottery administered by the State Controller with the proceeds to be distributed for educational purposes.

Moreover, any optimism over voter approval of a lottery proposition is tempered by remembrance that California voters rejected the last lottery proposition (in 1964) by a 2-to-1 margin. That defeat remains a fact to be reckoned with, although there was substantial opposition to that proposal because, unlike the present proposal, the lottery was not to be state-operated.

Dog Racing

Assembly Bill 935 (Powers) authorizes the conduct of pari-mutuel wagering on dog racing to help support the public school system. Assemblyman Powers points to Florida, where dog racing outdraws horse racing and jai alai combined, as an example of what California can expect from passage of AB 935. Revenue estimates for dog racing in California range as high as $113 million annually.

Jai Alai

Assembly Bill 501 (Quimby) permits the conduct of pari-mutuel betting on the ancient Basque sport of jai alai. Unlike the lottery and dog racing measures, Assemblyman Quimby's bill does not limit the revenue proceeds to support for education; funds derived from AB 501 would be credited to the state's general fund for appropriation by the Legislature as needed. Quimby's bill also contains detailed provisions for the licensing and regulation of jai alai, including supervision by the California Horse Racing Board.

Although several legislative studies have indicated that pari-mutuel wagering on jai alai may well be an important new source of tax dollars, most legislators do not expect AB 501 to find substantial support. In three previous attempts, Quimby has been unable to move a jai alai bill to the Assembly floor.

Casino Study Dropped

Despite all of the interest in increased gambling revenues, SB 105 (Song), which would have created a commission to conduct studies of all possible forms of legalized gambling, failed to receive approval from the Senate Governmental Organization Committee and will not be revived, according to Senator Song. The study mandate of the Song bill included specific provision for study of casino-type gambling within specified geographical areas adjacent to Nevada. The desirability of such a study was indicated in a report on gambling revenues by the Legislative Analyst in which he indicated that Californians spend $185 million on gambling in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nevada, providing an estimated $20 million in revenue to that state.

Off-Track Betting

Off-track betting, which may be the most readily acceptable form of increased gambling as an extension of existing on-site betting at race tracks, has not been actively pursued in the Legislature this session. Early in the year several legislators, including Assembly Speaker Bob Moretti, expressed support for the introduction of off-track betting but did not do so. They apparently want to await the results of at least a year's experience from New York City's off-track betting system before actively pushing a California version.

Revived Interest Nationally

The upturn of interest in new forms of legalized gambling as sources of state revenue is not restricted to California. Across the nation state legislatures are debating the virtues of gambling revenue with a fervor bred of discovery that these gambling proposals — for the most part hardy perennials which seldom receive serious attention — are suddenly being taken seriously by other legislatures and the public. At the same time many of the most stalwart opponents are softening and even abandoning their opposition in the face of economic necessity. New York State Senator Earl W. Brydes, for example, a long-time foe of state-run gambling, as proposed that New York permit wide-open casinos along with its state lottery and legalized bookie parlors. "I'm looking at it pragmatically now," Brydes observed. "If we're going to do it, let's go all the way and develop the greatest revenue from the people who can best afford to pay."

In neighboring New Jersey, the state-run lottery, which began last December is exceeding earlier revenue projections with indications that it will probably double the original $10 million figure by year's end. A proposal is also before the New Jersey legislature to provide a public referendum on casino gambling in Atlantic City.

More Horse Racing

Action by the California Legislature to increase state revenues from gambling this year, however, will probably be restricted to the established form, which is pari-mutuel betting on horseracing. In the 1970-71 fiscal year, horse racing produced $68 million in state revenue.

Assembly Bill 217 (Ralph) permits the California Horse Racing Board to allocate up to 12 additional weeks of quarterhorse racing in the state by 1974. Senate Bill 519 (Kennick) increases the available number of weeks of harness racing by 11. To avoid concentration of racing in Los Angeles County, where almost all of the thoroughbred racing is now conducted (at Hollywood Park and Santa Anita), none of the new harness or quarterhorse racing is permitted in that county.

Despite opposition from owners and breeders of thoroughbred racehorses, who fear that additional racing will adversely affect their segment of the industry and were able to block similar efforts last session, the two bills met little legislative resistance this year.

PUBLIC OPINION STRONGLY FAVORS MORE GAMBLING

There appears to be considerable latent voter sentiment in this state to legalize various forms of gambling as a source of additional state revenue, according to a recent California Poll by Mervin D. Field.

At present the public seems disposed to permit a state lottery and off-track betting on horse races. There is also substantial sentiment for Nevada casino-type gambling and for gambling on jai alai games.

Legalized betting on dog races is apparently the most contentious of the forms of possible legalized gambling which were posed to a representative cross-section of voters in this state in the latest California Poll survey.

Various types of gambling were suggested as possible new sources of state tax revenue. Respondents were asked to say whether they thought each of these various forms of licensed gambling for tax purposes was a good idea or a poor idea:

	Good Idea	Poor Idea	No Opinion
Off-track betting	69%	24%	7%
State lottery	69	26	5
Casino-type gambling	57	37	6
Dog racing	50	41	9
Jai alai	48	33	19

* * *

Democrats in the Legislature have generally been more receptive to proposals legalizing various forms of gambling than have Republicans. This conclusion is based on the fact that: 1) public statements of support for the various gambling bills are more often made by Democrats; 2) all of the bills introduced this year are authored by Democrats; and 3) available roll call votes on horseracing bills generally show more Democrats than Republicans casting affirmative votes.

In order to determine whether this pattern of legislative support was also reflected in voter sentiment, *California Journal* obtained exclusive tabulations from the California Poll dividing the responses to each question according to party preference. The results demonstrate that Democrats are only marginally more pro-gambling than are Republicans. The only significant difference seems to be preference for casino-type gambling, where 61% of the Democrats, in contrast to 52% of the Republicans, indicated it was a good idea.

Listed below are responses to the survey by party breakdown:

		Good Idea	Poor Idea	No Opinion
Off-track betting	*Rep.*	71	23	6
	Dem.	69	23	8
State lottery	*Rep.*	68	29	3
	Dem.	71	23	6
Casino-type gambling	*Rep.*	52	45	3
	Dem.	61	29	10
Dog racing	*Rep.*	48	44	8
	Dem.	52	38	10
Jai alai	*Rep.*	46	38	16
	Dem.	49	29	22

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

California Journal/*NEWSBRIEFS*

August Vacation Recess of Legislature Appears Certain

Plans are underway to hold a summer recess of the Legislature for the entire month of August. The Senate and Assembly leadership have endorsed the plan, and approval by caucus of each house is expected to precede introduction of a formal resolution. In 1970, there was some sentiment among Senators for an August recess to permit members to spend part of the summer months vacationing with their families. This year the lag in the session, particularly in resolving congressional and legislative reapportionment plans, has led to the agreement to recess for the month of August. Since a resolution has already been enacted setting July 31st as the final day of the session, a new resolution must be passed by both houses. The Constitution requires the agreement of both houses for a recess of more than three days.

People's Lobby Initiative Qualifies for 1972 Ballot

A campaign to place on the 1972 ballot a very broad initiative measure designed to solve many environmental problems in one trip to the ballot box has succeeded, according to Secretary of State Edmund G. Brown, Jr.

The campaign to secure the requisite signatures was conducted primarily in southern California by an organization called the People's Lobby.

Specifically, the initiative would:

- phase out leaded gasoline by 1976 and set standards for olefins and aromatics in gasoline, and sulfur content of diesel fuel;
- grant authority to air pollution control officers to shut down any polluting source if it has received four or more variances in the preceding five years;
- allow air pollution control districts to require installation of sealed monitoring devices and provide for their inspection;
- require the shut-down of any plant operating on a variance when air quality standards are exceeded;
- establish the right of the people to obtain immediate court injunction against polluters;
- set an incentive levy for violators of pollution regulations whereby the polluter pays a sizable sum each day until polluting sources are corrected, and then 75 percent of the levy is returned;
- make public all records of air pollution control districts;
- prohibit conflict of interest for appointees to state and regional air and water quality boards;
- suspend licenses of dealers who sell vehicles which do not comply with state emission standards;
- ban new offshore and coastal oil drilling and prevent renewal of old leases;
- impose a five-year moratorium on new nuclear power plants; and
- ban persistent chlorinated hydrocarbons (DDT, DDD, aldrin, BHC, chlordane, *et al.)*

The measure is expected to generate considerable controversy, even among conservation groups who are fearful that some of the legal problems raised by the initiative will impair implementation of legislative action on environmental problems.

Repeal of the 1970 Antibusing Law Receives Assembly Approval

By the barest of majorities (41-27), the Assembly acted this month to approve a bill, authored by Assemblyman William T. Bagley, to repeal the 1970 state law prohibiting the busing of school children for racial integration or any other purpose without written parental consent. Nine Republicans and 32 Democrats voted in favor of repeal, 19 Republicans and eight Democrats voted against it (see Voting Record). The action followed an earlier vote last month when Bagley could not obtain the necessary votes for passage. In January, the California Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the anti-busing statute but also held that pupils can still be assigned to schools outside of their districts for integration purposes.

UC President Proposes New Regent Selection Commission

UC President Charles Hitch, testifying before the Higher Education Subcommittee of the Assembly Education Committee on May 25th, proposed creation of a Select Commission on University Regents to nominate appointees to the Board of Regents. The commission, said Hitch, should be "a distinguished panel whose sole responsibility would be to discover candidates of high qualification for service as Regents and to nominate these candidates for the Governor's consideration."

Hitch made his proposal as an alternative to a variety of bills now before the Committee which would shorten the terms of the Regents (now 16 years) and change the board's membership. Hitch said that he would favor shorter terms only if the University gains additional protection from partisan political control through creation of the new "high level" selection panel.

The selection commission, as Hitch proposed it, would be chaired by the Chief Justice of the State Supreme Court, and would include the Assembly Speaker, the Senate President pro Tem, the chairman of the Board of Regents, the Chairman of the Academic Senate, a student representative, and four "public" members designated by the Legislature.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CRLA Funding Still Subject To Reagan Veto

The attempts of the Reagan and Nixon administrations to reach an understanding on the controversial issue of continued federal funding for California Rural League Assistance (CRLA) was the subject of a three-hour meeting on May 24, between Frank Carlucci, director of the Office of Economic Opportunity and Governor Reagan's chief staff aide, Edwin Meese III. Following the meeting, Meese said Carlucci had affirmed that any application for re-funding of CRLA would be subject to a gubernatorial veto by Reagan. Carlucci made no comment.

In seeking the clarification, Meese hoped resolve one of the main points of contention in the CRLA controversy which erupted when Carlucci, following White House review of the case, issued a $600,000 grant to fund CRLA for six months, and appointed a three-judge panel to investigate the issue. The Reagan administration has consistently maintained that the Governor's veto was upheld and that therefore the administration did not have to prove its case in what they felt were "adversary proocedings".

The Meese announcement could result in the bypassing of the commission investigation on the basis that the President has already exercised his opportunity to override the Reagan veto, an action which is by no means clear from the actions or statements of federal OEO officials.

Democrats Approve Party Restructuring Plan, Propose Legislation

Meeting in San Jose this month, California's Democratic Party leaders, approved a party restructuring plan that replaces the 58 existing county central committees with area committees as the smallest units of party structure. State party chairman Charles T. Manatt said the reorganization is designed to "open the doors to citizen participation." According to the plan, the maximum size of each of the areas is ten precincts, with each area electing five committeemen. Representatives from the area would form the basis for membership in Assembly district units and these 80 units would form the basis for representation on the state committee.

Taxpayers Association Opposes Statewide Tax for Schools

A representative of the California Taxpayers' Association, appearing before the Assembly and Senate Education committees, testified against proposals to levy a statewide property tax for support of the public schools. According to the Cal Tax spokesman, Charles L. Smithers, the organization disagrees with the concept of the proposal, which he said, would "equalize educational opportunity in terms of the financial resources of schools as reflected in per pupil expenditures, teacher ratios, etc." Instead of equalizing school funding, Smithers said that the Legislature should "focus on specific needs in specific districts." Cal Tax also opposes the statewide property tax for "many other reasons," according to Smithers, "some of which are quite separate and apart from the subject of education."

Cal Tax was reported to be in favor of a statewide property tax in a March 1971 article in the *California Journal*. Robert C. Brown, Cal Tax's Executive Vice President, served as a member of the Statewide Council on Long-Range School Finance Planning which recommended a $3.75 statewide property tax.

PUC Drops Study of Rules Changes And Staff Rotation Plan

In what appeared to be a response to heavy pressure from the Legislature, the Public Utilities Commission announced in mid-May that it had dropped its study of proposed changes in its rules of procedures and had also ended its staff rotation plan. In a unanimous statement, the commission reported that it found "no useful purpose would be accomplished by making substantial changes, revisions or additions to the rules of practice and procedure at this time." The proposed rules changes contained several elements which opponents charged would have curtailed consumer testimony in rate cases *(California Journal,* April 1971, page 104).

In lieu of the widely criticized staff rotation plan, which had been initiated at the direction of PUC President John P. Vukasin Jr., it was announced that the commission would ask the State Personnel Board to help it prepare a long-range staff training program. This alternative had been suggested earlied by the Legislative Analyst.

Doctors Present Program to Remove Medi-Cal from Political Pressure

A program of health care for the poor, to "take Medi-Cal out of politics," was submitted to the Legislature by the California Medical Association. Senator Anthony C. Beilenson, chairman of the Senate Health and Welfare Committee, introduced the program.

The CMA-sponsored plan creates a public corporation titled "California Medi-Cal Authority" and abolishes the present Department of Health Care Services. The authority would be run by a 15-member board which would receive an annual appropriation from the Legislature to furnish prescribed benefits at a predetermined amount per capita. The board would in turn contract with Medi-Cal providers at the beginning of each year for the necessary services. Under the proposal, according to Beilenson, "the providers would have to absorb any costs for their services over the fixed per capita amount agreedupon."

Ten Candidates Announce for State Senate Vacancy in LA

A special election to be held June 22nd to fill the unexpired term of Democrat George Danielson, who resigned his 27th Senatorial District seat last January when he was sworn in as a member of Congress, has drawn ten candidates. Five Democrats, four Republicans, and one member of the Peace and Freedom Party submitted their nomination papers for the Los Angeles County seat, which is considered Democratic in its voting pattern. Two Assemblymen, Alex P. Garcia and David A. Roberti, are among the Democrats in the race. If no candidate gets a majority of the votes cast, a run-off among the top candidates in each party will be held July 22nd.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Republican Party: Cal Plan and Coexistance

BY THOMAS JESSE GOFF JR.

Eight years ago, a Southern California obstetrician by the name of Gaylord Parkinson turned the Republican party's impotent state apparatus into an effective and efficient machine for winning legislative elections. Parkinson, who took up the vice-chairmanship of the Republican State Central Committee at a time when Republican candidates were everywhere in rout, devised a campaign program called the California Plan to focus previously scattered state party resources in the critical legislative races. The innovative political strategy Parkinson developed was programmed to gradually increase Republican seats in the state Legislature until 1970, by which time the Republican party would control both legislative houses and the decennial reapportionment of congressional and legislative districts.

When Putnam Livermore was elected chairman of the state central committee at the beginning of this year, one year after the Cal Plan target year, it was on the heels of a narrow and bitter defeat of Parkinson's legislative strategy. Impressively successful in carrying out the plan in earlier elections, the Republicans won the legislative control they sought in 1969, only to find that they were unable to maintain that position in the 1970 elections. Livermore's term of office takes on added importance in the wake of that defeat. His chairmanship could well determine whether the 1970 elections were only a momentary setback for the Republican party in Calfornia or the beginning of a gradual deterioration of Republican political power that has always greatly exceeded the party's registration.

The State Committee

The Republican State Central Committee elects the party chairman and, like its Democratic counterpart, is legally responsible for managing party affairs in California. The creation of the unwieldly central committee — purposefully swollen by legislation fifty years ago to an unworkable 1,000 or more members — was perhaps the cruelest joke of the anti-party Progressive reforms. More convention than committee, the highest state-level party organ is obviously incapable of guiding party affairs on a regular basis.

As a consequence, each party delegates most of its state central committee's duties to an executive committee, a grouping of over 100 members which meets, at the call of the party chairman, on the average of four times a year. The membership of these executive committees, however, is chosen to represent all elements of the party, including extralegal groups such as the club federations. Thus these executive committees, too, are too large to be efficient party managers and are generally relegated to periodic policy determinations. Actual managerial duties and decisions are delegated to the central committee chairmen and their officers, who are elected by the state central committees at their biennial conventions.

This distillation of power into the hands of the party chairman and his associates might be expected to make that official a man of immense sway in party politics. Any student of California politics and the Republican party in this state knows, however, that this has not been so. Until the early '60's and the appearance of Dr. Parkinson, the Republican state party chairman was almost totally without power and, with a Republican Governor in Sacramento, generally irrelevant to the political processes surrounding the biennial elections.

The historic weakness of the state party apparatus was maintained in part through its domination by legislators who saw little advantage to themselves or their candidacies in a strong and aggressive state party bureaucracy. They saw to it that political funding in the state went directly to individual candidates, rather than being channelled through the central party offices. In this and other ways the legislators made certain that the state party remained irrelevant to the local districts where elections were won or lost and legislative careers made or broken.

The California Plan

The Cal Plan which upset and replaced the old way of doing things has become, as a consequence, nearly synonymous with the state Republican party. Faced with a string of disastrous Democratic victories in the late fifties and early sixties, the Republicans in 1962 under Parkinson's leadership introduced what they described as a "rifle" approach to state legislative politics, a plan for concentrating state resources in key legislative races. Through the Cal Plan, as it became known, Parkinson was able to turn the liability of legislative dominance in the state party into an asset by concentrating his central committee staff on the problem of winning legislative races against incumbent Democrats. Directed only at the marginal Democratic districts and religiously "neutral" in the philosophical disputes that tore the party's volunteer clubs, Parkinson's Cal Plan had an immediate impact in several individual campaigns and thus in the legislative campaigns generally.

The Cal Plan continues to operate much as it was first defined by Parkinson in 1962. A year or more before the primary elections, the party chairman appoints a representative selection of central committee members to a standing committee which is called the California Plan Committee. The size of the committee has grown with its success so that today every element of the party is represented, including the party's legislative leadership, the Governor's staff, club and regional representatives, and even some county chairmen from the larger urban counties.

Blueprint for Victory

The plan was originally a blueprint for progressively gaining control of the state Legislature by 1970. The process begins about a year before each primary when professional consulting firms, Republican caucus employees in the Legislature, and paid members of the state chairman's own staff begin to analyze what are generally believed to be the ten Democratic Assembly districts in which a Republican victory is most likely. From these ten, usually five are selected as the most

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"vulnerable" for Republican seizure and they are designated as priority "target districts."

During the fall and winter months, state party staff members and officials visit the target areas and help local elements of the party identify and recruit potential candidates. It is considered crucial to the strategy that eligible candidates in these districts be identified by February or March of the election year. At this stage paid campaign specialists, such as employees of the firm of Spencer-Roberts & Associates, are put under formal contract to the state committee to shepherd the target campaigns and to assist in platform development.

Central Committee Staff

Involvement with the Cal Plan has transformed the staffing of the state party which in the past was considered fortunate to have secretarial assistance available to it on a permanent basis. Presently, Livermore has a core of approximately twelve permanent staff members who are for the most part young, ideologically detached professionals with some campaign experience, and who reflect the "studied neutrality" that Parkinson and his successors have promoted. Sacramento is home base for most of Livermore's permanent staff. A party communications director, a field operations director and an administrative officer are located in the state capital, although their jobs take them all over the state. During a campaign year, the staff may swell to nearly thirty positions, including field workers who are assigned to specific campaigns and districts. (Candidates for statewide office tend to ignore the state committee staff, relying instead on the original campaign teams they have put together in the primary battles.)

The actual involvement of the central committee staff in a specific legislative campaign varies, depending upon the needs of the campaign and the priority placed upon it by the Cal Plan committee. Generally, district activity ranges from developing attractive publicity materials for the candidate to actual campaign management. As an example of the latter, Kenneth Maddy's successful campaign in the 30 percent Republican 32nd Assembly District relied heavily on state party support and the frequent presence of state party field director, Darryl Wold.

The Republicans' long association with Spencer-Roberts has left its mark on the state party. In many respects the state party staff is hardly distinguishable in the heat of an election from the Spencer-Roberts people. Ostensibly, in these legislative campaigns, the Spencer-Roberts firm acts as a consultant to the state staff. In fact, "Stu" Spencer, legislative consultant in the 1970 elections, concentrated his energies on the southern California target districts, while the state central committee staff handled northern California from its Sacramento base.

Finances

It costs big money to sustain the state apparatus and its campaign activity: over $1 million for every two year cycle. Of this amount, the staff admits to spending up to 25 percent on administrative costs alone. The rest is channeled into individual campaigns, both in the regular general elections and in the special elections in which the Republicans have recently been so successful.

The sources of the central committee's money are varied. Some comes in from the biennial direct mail solicitation that the staff sends out to party members throughout the state. The return on such mailings is tremendous, with as much as $80,000 coming in from one solicitation. Another source of revenue is the quota levied on each county central committee in proportion to the party registration and the general population in the county. Money also comes in from lobbyists and others who buy tickets to state committee dinners held twice each year.

A unique arrangement between the county and state committees works to their mutual advantage in fund raising. County committees are free to call upon the state staff to organize local benefits and to recruit a national political figure or celebrity to boost attendance. In return, the state committee gets a 20-25 percent cut off the top of the event's proceeds, and this money is deducted from the county's quota.

Governor Reagan has been the center of major Republican fund raising efforts on the state and local level since 1966. Some of the money the Governor raises is kept in a personal expense account for his use by the central committee to cover party related travel and business. A fee of this type of $25,000, received for an appearance in New Hampshire, gained a good deal of attention in the press earlier this year. Most of the money raised by Reagan, however, stays with the local party unit to strengthen local campaigning.

Peaked Too Soon

In retrospect it can be seen that the Cal Plan strategy peaked too soon. The Republicans beat their own target dates for control of both houses in the Legislature by two years only to see their narrow margin of victory disappear in the 1970 elections.

In large part this was because a number of unanticipated changes had taken place by the time the 1970 election arrived. For the first time, the Cal Plan committeee had to deal with defensive battles and the necessity of holding threatened incumbent seats. Committee members had scrupulously avoided this role in the past to avert intra-legislative jealousies. Also, Governor Reagan had turned his attention away from legislative races in 1970 to the statewide offices and his own candidacy. And, for the first time, Dennis Carpenter, who was then state chairman, was not available to lead the Cal Plan committee as he had done in every campaign since 1963. The chairmanship fell to Cliff Anderson, and Carpenter found much of his time was spent raising money, a task previously undertaken by the Governor. Carpenter also ran and won his own special state Senate election late in 1970, and that certainly diverted his attention from party affairs.

Added problems for the Cal Plan are on the horizon. A decision has already been made to include the five new congressional seats that reapportionment will open up in California as a Cal Plan priority. Time and money devoted to these races will undoubtedly have to come from what would otherwise be devoted to the committee's traditional concentratioon on state legislative races.

The Chairman's Job

The job of Republican party chairman is a precarious one for a man with an eye to his political fu-

(Continued on page 145)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Republican State Chairman Putnam Livermore Assesses the Party's Position and Prospects

Putnam Livermore, attorney and former chairman of the San Francisco County Republican Central Committee, was elected chairman of his party's state central committee in January, 1971. This interview was conducted in the office of the California Journal *May 11th.*

California Journal: You have had an active career in Republican campaigns and politics. Would you sketch briefly how it was you came to be Republican State Chairman?

Putnam Livermore: I started out in 1958 working for a law school classmate of mine by the name of John Busterud, who was then running for the Assembly. He missed it the first time by about 150 votes, and this impressed on me the value of precinct work. I tried it again with him, going door-to-door the next time, and he won. This started me in the precinct work, and I became election day chairman for all of San Francisco. After that I became precinct chairman for all of San Francisco, and then Vice-Chairman of the State Committee and now Chairman. So I've come up through the nuts and bolts of precinct work.

Journal: What exactly is the role of political parties in government and public affairs in California?

Livermore: Well, I think, simply put, the role of the party in California and elsewhere is to find, elect and sustain in office people of ability and integrity.

Journal: And how does the Republican State Central Committee go about organizing to do that?

Livermore: The State Central Committee in our party consists of some 1,215 appointees of the nominees of the party. They're the voting members of the State Central Committee. In January of this year they met, as they do every two years, and elected their officers. Then the chairman appoints the various working committees and about half of the members of the 78-member Executive Committee, which is the governing body of our party. The chairman also has charge of the operations of the State Central Committee and appoints the staff and has the power to appoint an Executive Director, for example, to assist him as operating head of the party. We have about 12 professional employees right now. We have offices in Sacramento, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Santa Ana. We hope to have headquarters in San Diego and Fresno, as well.

Journal: What do you see as your principal role—to try to maintain unity and to administer the Cal-Plan?

Livermore: I think that during the years since 1964, when we were going through a difficult period, the party generally has been quite unified, so I would see the role of chairman not only as presiding over the Cal-Plan, but in broadening out the membership of the party, being spokesman for the party positions, and supporting the President and the Governor. I think the fact that our party has gained 5 percent on the Democrats during the '60's in registration demonstrates that we've progressed not only in the Cal-Plan in coming up on the Democrats in the districts, but in broadening the base of the party and its membership.

Journal: The Cal-Plan was supposed to have produced Republican control of the Legislature this year. What happened last year to prevent that?

Livermore: Well, we did elect five out of the six partisan constitutional officers, including the first Republican Attorney General in 25 years. And we picked up one Congressional seat, which has gone a little unnoticed, I think. Out of nine open legislative seats in the state Legislature, we won six. These are the good points.

The bad points are, of course, losing George Murphy, the United States Senator, and losing control of the two houses of the Legislature by a narrow margin, and I emphasize that, because there's only 20-19 in the Senate and 43-37 in the Assembly.

Now the reasons for this, I think, are several. First of all, I think that with such a popular and outstanding Governor the workers were a little overconfident. Being the minority party, we have to work extra hard to win elections. During the preceding two years we won seven straight special elections by just working harder than the Democrats and, I think, getting better candidates. But in general this time there was a little over-confidence.

Secondly, the economic situation was a factor. Unemployment was up a little higher at that time than we hope it will be for the rest of this year and next year.

I think there is a third reason, of which there has been very little mention, and that is the Democrat gerrymander in the 1960's. We literally have to get anywhere from 3 to 10 percent more than the Democrats to win. For example, we got very close to 50 percent of the statewide Assembly vote, yet the lines of the gerrymander gave us 37 seats to the Democrats' 43. In Congress the same was true; we got very close to 50 percent of the total vote, and yet we are one down. In that state Senate, we got 49.5 percent of the statewide vote and we only got 40 percent of the Senate seats up. So this is a tremendous factor against us.

Journal: What is the relationship between the official party structure and such other elements of the party structure as the Governor, the nominal head of the party, and the Spencer-Roberts public relations firm, which is clearly an arm of the party in some respects?

Livermore: The Governor has a very great interest in the party, in helping the party, helping to strengthen it. He is very interested, too, in the concept of volunteer politics, which is characteristic of California, as distinguished from the Eastern politics with their greater patronage and big city machines.

The Governor is so strong in terms of the party's loyalty to him that he doesn't need to dictate to the party, and he doesn't. Since I've been chairman I've

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

never had him or any of his staff tell me that a committee has to be appointed or structured a certain way. The party is an independent entity in California. In the recent race for the current vice-chairman, the Governor made his choice known, but, once again, he didn't dictate it. He said, "This is the person I want", and the Governor is so strong that that's entitled to a lot of weight. But there is a distinction here, and I feel that the way he has approached this shows all the more how strong he really is, because he unifies the party and leads by example.

Now as far as Spencer-Roberts goes, we have had help from them in some elections; in others they have not helped us, so we don't have a standard practice that they help us in all elections. They're a very fine professional firm, and they've helped the Governor, of course, in both of his elections. In the seven special elections in the last two years, I don't think they were in more than two or three. The state committee had a very strong role in a lot of those elections. In the 1970 general election, of course, Spencer-Roberts ran the Governor's campaign, and they helped in some of the other elections. But they're not a part of the state committee, *per se*. They're an independent organization that has helped us in some races and not in others.

Hugo

Journal: If you've got your own people who can do what Spencer-Roberts does, will there come a day when Spencer-Roberts will no longer be necessary?

Livermore: I think that over the last six years the State Central Committee staff has improved in experience and professionalism, and so we have been moving in the direction of being self-sustaining. But we'll never be self-sustaining in a state as big as this, at least for the foreseeable future, because there are so many campaigns going on that we literally cannot run them all. In the case of the special election, of course, the state committee has an unusually large role each time, because you have one election and we can have our young staff go in there and the veterans play a tremendous role. The new people learn from the election.

But when you've got the state which is the largest in the Union and you have twenty Senators, eighty Assemblymen, and forty-three Congressmen, that's 143 elections next year. You cannot sustain a staff in a pre-election year big enough to absorb that, so we must, as the Democrats do, have independent firms that come in to help us. But the trend has been towards the building of a good, young professional group in the state committee.

Even though we have a good professional staff, we always have, and still do, rely mainly on volunteers for work. This is very characteristic of the California political process, where the precinct workers by the hundreds, even thousands all over the state work and are not paid. When I've gone back to Eastern meetings with Eastern political leaders, they think this is quite unique. But that's the California style.

Now this last time, to my dismay, we noted that the Democrats paid tens of thousands of dollars to precinct workers. I think this was another possible factor in what happened last year. This is the way the Democrats apparently are going. Jess Unruh paid election day workers. These people paid last year were apparently registrars, and they'd go around and get so much for each registration. We haven't done that.

Journal: Would you like to tell the Democratic readers of *California Journal* how you've managed to keep your very liberal and very conservative elements united in one party?

Livermore: Several factors have contributed to this, I think. We've had a pattern for the latter part of the '60's of realizing that we are the minority party. Although we're gaining on the Democrats — I see we gained against them in January, now we're up to 41 percent — there is a general realization that since we are in the minority party, we have to be united. We can't afford the luxury of taking what energy we have for politics and expending it on intra-family squabbles. But we've had ours. I think it taught us a lesson.

Secondly, as I mentioned before, the Governor is a very unifying element. Thirdly, many of us who worked through the '60's know each other around the state and know liberals and conservatives who are the Party-oriented people who are interested in finding good young candidates and working for them.

In my own case, I come from San Francisco, a Democratic stronghold, but I think what helped me over the years was the fact that I had worked just for the county committee and the party and Cal-Plan. I've been, you might say, a pragmatist, and this helps me in my position. I get along with the liberals and conservatives, and I think that tolerance in politics is a very important quality. The idea is that you have a deep belief in the two-party system and in your particular party that you've chosen, so you give up a little of your sovereignty. You're tolerant of the views of other persons within your party because you find a common thread of philosophy, if you want to call it that, in your party.

Journal: It has been charged that there were two things the Democrats did last year that were somewhat questionable in the tradition of California politics. One, which you mentioned, was the paying of some workers that ordinarily work on a volunteer basis. The other was the use of the legislative staff for key campaign responsibilities of various sorts. Would you care to comment on that?

Livermore: Yes, I would. The use of paid precinct workers is a distinct departure from the California tradition of the citizen who is politically motivated to work with his party towards better government and not getting a job or cash payment for it. The use of the legislative staff is once again not in the best political tradition in the state. The Democrats have done this for years. I think one of the reasons the Democratic party has not been as united and as strong in California is because their political workers traditionally have been on Pat Brown's payroll or the legislative payroll, and this weakens the party.

Not having the political people over there explains a lot about the happy rapport now between Governor

(Continued on page 145)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Proponents Divided on Public Transit Funding

One of the key issues of the 1970 legislative session was the amendment of Article 26, the constitutional provision restricting the expenditure of gasoline tax revenues to highway related purposes. No less than five alternatives were introduced, each designed to free some or all of the one billion dollar highway fund to provide money for public transit and vehicular pollution control. These measures received unexpectedly strong support from the Assembly leadership, most urban legislators, the major state newspapers, and a broad variety of citizen action groups. Opposition came, predictably, from the interest groups associated with the highway lobby, including the State Chamber of Commerce, the auto clubs, and the oil companies.

After a long and hard-fought battle, SCA 18, a compromise measure, was passed out of the Legislature in late August and placed on the November ballot as Proposition 18. The proposed amendment permitted counties to use up to 25 percent of the revenues generated within their borders for the construction of mass rapid transit systems, provided that the voters of the county or multi-county transit district approved by a majority vote. Similarly, cities and counties were to be permitted to direct up to 25 percent of the funds they now receive for street and highway purposes to the construction of public transportation systems, subject to approval by the local voters.

The campaign for passage of Proposition 18 was a bitter one, and according to many observers the proposition's defeat by a margin of 46-to-54 percent was the result of extremely lopsided campaign funding on the part of the highway interests.

Switch to Sales Tax

It has always been successfully argued, particularly by the oil companies, that because gasoline is an essential commodity and already subject to a special gasoline tax, it should be exempted from the normal sales tax. But this year legislators, caught between the pressures for increased funds for rapid transit and the feeling that perhaps the November election was, in fact, a reflection of public sentiment, have redirected their attention to the sales tax as a source of public transit financing.

Despite their subsequent victory, the highway lobby was clearly shaken by last year's unexpectedly strong support for some sharing of the heretofore sacrosanct Highway Fund revenues. In order to protect that billion dollar fund from future and perhaps successful forays, some members of the lobby let it be known early in the season that they favored a specially earmarked gasoline sales tax as a method of financing public transit systems. Thus, the automobile clubs, the State Chamber of Commerce and the County Supervisors Association have joined in publicly supporting in principle the sales tax measures and in doing some active work on their behalf. Even some of the major oil companies are said to be backing away from their adamant opposition to any tax increase on gasoline.

Four separate measures have been introduced to remove the sales tax exemption from gasoline and to earmark the additional revenues for public transit. The key features of these measures are:

- AB 268 & 269 (Bagley): Lowers the fuel tax by one cent per gallon while imposing a sales tax of approximately the same amount. Provides that 50 percent of the new revenue shall be used by local government for roads, transit, and environmental protection. The remaining 50 percent shall be used by the state tax for the same purposes.
- AB 544 (Deddeh) : Removes sales tax exemption from gasoline. Appropriates $120 million the first year to a State Public Transportation Fund for use by transit districts and systems. Approximately $30 million would go to cities and counties of origin under the Bradley-Burns formula.
- SB 61 (Alquist) : Imposes a five percent sales tax on gasoline and returns one percent to cities and counties according to the Bradley-Burns formula. Puts the remaining $120 million in a Transit and Environmental Fund for distribution to counties with approved transit plans.
- SB 325 (Mills) : Applies the sales tax to gasoline but reduces state share of the sales and use tax from 4 to 3.75 percent. Authorizes local agencies responsible for transportation services to levy that .25 percent sales tax and use the proceeds for public transit purposes.

Early optimism about this approach has been somewhat eroded by the record for these four measures to date. SB 61 has been taken under submission by the Senate Revenue and Taxation Committee. SB 325 is presently held up in Senate Finance after winning approval from the Senate Public Utilities and Corporations Committee, chaired by Senator Alquist. AB 268 and 269 are being held in Assembly Transportation Committee awaiting the outcome of AB 544, which moved with considerable momentum through the Assembly and went to the Senate on May 24th. The critical question now facing AB 544 is its Senate committee assignment. Proponents are hoping to avoid the Revenue and Taxation Committee by having the bill sent to the more friendly Public Utilities and Corporations Committee, as was SB 325.

In the meantime, several of the citizen and conservation organizations, which support an amendment to Article 26 to redistribute gasoline tax funds, find themselves in the awkward position of opposing the sales tax bills. To these groups the sales tax is, at best, a stop-gap measure which will barely furnish sufficient revenue to cover present public transportation operating deficits. These deficits are estimated to be somewhere around $100 million a year. At worst, they see these bills as a well-calculated conspiracy organized by the highway lobby to divert mounting efforts to get at the "big" money, the fuel tax revenues.

Thus, the Tuberculosis and Respiratory Disease Association, a key organizer of the pro-Proposition 18 campaign, is formally opposing all the sales tax measures. Others, including the Sierra Club and the Planning and Conservation League, have expressed their

(Continued on next page)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LIVERMORE *(Continued from page 143)*

Reagan and the Republican Party. He feels the political workers should be over in the party where they belong. This is a very healthy thing for the party system.

Journal: The Democrats met in San Jose this month to consider some changes in the party structure that will tie the local party organization much more closely to the statewide party organization. Traditionally they have been pretty well segregated. Is that a direction that the Republican party is thinking of going? Would that be a healthy thing for California politics?

Livermore: Well, the way I understand their proposal, they're going to do as you say — try to make the party more monolithic so that there isn't this separation between the county committees and the state committees, and they're also going to try to eliminate the legal prohibition against endorsement, unless I'm mistaken. Now, both of those, I think, will tend to move the Democratic Party in this state towards the Eastern style political set-up that I've just described, and I think that once again this is a departure from recent history in California.

Hiram Johnson, I believe in about 1910, got certain legislation which provides the groundwork for our present political party system in California. The parties, in their statutory provisions, are not very strong — no power of endorsement, separation of the state committee and the county committees. This was all done at that time to break the power of companies, and then Hiram Johnson went on further in the area where he didn't need to go but wanted to, and he weakened the party structure.

To go back to those days of Hiram Johnson, towards making the parties, as I say, a pyramid, a monolith, could tend toward bringing back the very abuses that he sought to correct.

Journal: Yours is a two year term. What are your goals between now and 1973?

Livermore: Well, my goals are to carry California for the President, to get a majority in the congressional delegation after the election, and to regain a few seats in the Legislature, so that instead of a narrow minority position we have a majority position. Beyond those, I want to reach out for the young people and the minority groups. The Republican Party was founded on bedrock of equal opportunity. Before the '30's and the Great Depression, we had a tremendous share of the minority vote.

As for the young people, I think that when they see that our party once again is the peace party and we are winding the war down the way we did the Korean War, and that we have had and are having a tremendous role in the preservation of the environment, we will have a great share of their vote. I noticed in the Gallup Poll, in 1970 as contrasted with 1968, we still get less of the young people's vote. But the interesting thing is that the Democrats' loss among the young people was three times ours. Ours stayed very steady — dropped 1 or 2 points between '68 and '70. The Democrats came down seven percent, and the young people are going independent very strongly.

Finally, of course we want a fair reapportionment bill, and that's very important to us.

REPUBLICANS *(Continued from page 141)*

ture. Enemies are easily made and friends often not long lasting. Moreover, the job is part-time and offers no compensation beyond expenses, so that the position falls mainly to relatively wealthy businessmen and professionals who can afford to spend two years in that fashion.

The duties required of the Republican chairman, beyond "winning elections," are not specified. Hence the style of the man tends to shape the job. Dennis Carpenter preferred to delegate authority and hired a full-time director, Ed Debolt, to handle the day-to-day problems and to keep tabs on the staff. Livermore operates differently, without an executive director, and visits the Sacramento office at least twice a week to confer with the staff and direct policy.

Deep philosophical differences in the Republican party are concealed beneath the tranquil surface that men such as Livermore, Carpenter and Parkinson seek to project. Often the greatest challenge the chairman of the party faces, therefore, is to sustain that image of unity, not only in the eyes of the general public but for the party worker as well. Thus a chairman's "studied neutrality" can be his greatest strength. Accordingly, the power Livermore will exercise in party politics in the next two years will depend to a very large extent on his ability to balance the varied and often conflicting interests united beneath the Republican banner.

GAS TAX *(Continued from previous page)*

concern that the sales tax measures are inadequate.

When Proposition 18 was defeated in November, Assemblyman John Foran and Senator James Mills, authors of the principal constitutional amendments proposed in 1970, promised to reintroduce their measures in the 1971 session, believing that the election did not truly reflect the public will. Both have done so, Foran with ACA 16 and Mills with SCA 26.

Both Mills and Foran have held their measures back until the fate of the sales tax proposals becomes apparent. Thus, both authors retain the ability to advance their bills after the sales tax measures run into trouble. Several citizen action groups are making preparations to place a gas tax amendment on the ballot by means of an initiative petition in the event that no amendment emerges from the Legislature this session.

In spite of the uneasy but powerful coalition of local government, public transit proponents and major segments of the highway lobby now supporting the sales tax concept, its future is by no means guaranteed. Unfriendly committees and unnecessary competition between rival authors may yet block passage of any gasoline sales tax bill this year.

Moreover, the Governor's position remains unknown. Each of the sales tax measures except AB 268 (Bagley) constitutes a tax increase, which he has said he will oppose, but Reagan has not taken a public stand against any of the bills. Nor is he known to be working against them. He has repeatedly taken the position, however, that the development of public transit facilities should be contingent upon a local vote (a position also held by the State Chamber of Commerce), and he may hold out for the inclusion of this principle in any sales tax measure he will sign.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LETTER FROM WASHINGTON
By Lou Cannon

The Greenery of May

May 24, 1971

May is the best of all months in Washington, the month when the rains and the sun join in replenishing the Potomac and the parkways and the nearby green walled hills of Maryland, the month when the scars left by demonstrators in the parks are overgrown with green grasses brought by this sun and rain.

May was the month this year when California officeholders shrewdly chose to cast their bread upon Washington's political waters and the month, too, when the thoughts of the Senate Interior Committee turned to the cool, green lands of the California north coast and Redwood National Park, created there after years of congressional maneuvering.

The notion that a redwoods park could prosper under state administration enjoyed some vogue during the salad days of the Reagan administration, but the concept of a state administered national park has now been killed deader than the dodo bird by that redoubtable senator from Washington, Interior Committee Chairman Henry M. Jackson.

Jackson is a senator's senator. Lacking the ability to walk on water, he was unable to save a supersonic transport that truly would have required divine intervention to survive the Senate. And he is going nowhere rapidly as a presidential candidate in a party that is tilting leftward as Jackson is bearing right.

But the Washington senator is by far the most influential, and often the wisest, member of either party on decisions affecting America's parklands, and he has made it clear to National Park Service officials that the Interior Committee never will permit a state operated national redwood park. "This (the redwoods park) is a national asset," Jackson declared at an Interior subcommittee meeting called to review progress on the park. "If there's anything that dramatizes preservation in the United States, it's the redwoods."

The National Park Service is not about to argue, inasmuch as Jackson and his Interior Committee control the allocations for all park service projects, including some $92 million for the redwood park. Nor, privately, is there any inclination to argue. Despite the purges in the higher reaches of Interior, most of the bureaucrats in the Park Service, as in the rest of the department, regard the plan for state administration as simply another Nixon administration appeasement of Governor Reagan. The bureaucrats, who enjoy a perspective not shared by either the President or the Democratic presidential contenders, are not all that concerned about the state-federal impasse. They realize that Reagan will not always be Governor and that someday the national park will be truly national.

"Can you imagine what other states would do if we allowed California to get away with taking over a national park?" shuddered one park service official soon after Senator Jackson had made precisely the same point in committee.

Whatever they would do, the other states are not going to have the chance. Lieutenant Governor Ed Reinecke, who risks slight danger of becoming confused with an apologist for big government, put it succinctly on his mid-May visit here: "If it's a national park, it's going to be administered by the Department of Interior. The department's not about to accept a whole new concept for national parks."

* * *

Reinecke and Assembly Speaker Bob Moretti stood out among the host of official visitors who during May gave up the difficulties of Sacramento for the tribulations of Washington. California legislators called upon to speak at Washington parties often bomb out by (1) proclaiming California's greatness or (2) becoming so defensive amidst people of national stature that they overcompensate by proclaiming California's greatness. Moretti, at a reception where Senators Ed Muskie and Birch Bayh also delivered impromptu speeches, remained himself and stole the show. Moretti also laid the groundwork, in an important meeting with Minnesota Rep. Donald Fraser, who now heads the Democratic convention arm popularly known as "the McGovern Commission," for acceptance of national convention guidelines that would allow California to select a portion of its delegation after the Democratic primary next June. This would enable the winners to shoehorn in some officeholders and dignitaries who back the losing horses. "It's called putting the party back together again," says Fraser, laconically.

* * *

And now, from those wonderful folks who gave you Orange County, we take you to the Washington reception held by public broadcasting for the one and only William F. Buckley, Jr.

Buckley is the interviewee in this one. The interviewer is Rep. John G. Schmitz, the Tustin Terror who formerly led the State Senate in negative roll calls.

"I want you to know that Father (Robert) Drinan and I are the only Catholics on the House Internal Security Committee," Schmitz says.

"Oh, is Father Drinan a Catholic?" Buckley responds.

For those who care, Father Drinan eschews being addressed as a priest by his congressional colleagues.

"Just call me Bobby," he says with a smile.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Police and Firemen Seek Binding Arbitration

"A major metropolitan area without police protection. A dry, hilly suburban area in Los Angeles during summer months without fire protection. These are frightening prospects."

So reads the lead statement in a memorandum prepared by the Senate Majority Caucus and distributed to the Senate membership to explain SB 333, authored by Senator Ralph C. Dills, which requires compulsory and binding arbitration for local safety employees and their public agency employers. For those who have followed reports of strikes by police and firemen in California and elsewhere during the past year, it was no hollow threat.

In 1968, legislation was approved mandating public agencies, other than school districts and the state itself, to meet and confer in good faith with their employees and to endeavor to reach agreement on wages, hours and conditions of employment. Senate Bill 1228 of the 1968 Session, which was titled the Meyers-Milias-Brown Act, further provides that if agreement cannot be reached, the impasse can be resolved by third-party mediation, provided all parties agree to submit to mediation or fact finding. The results of an agreement, however, are not binding upon the interested legislative body.

Model Legislation

One year after its adoption, California's new law received endorsement from the Federal Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations as a recommended model for all states to follow. Fire fighters and police officers, however, have not been happy with this law and have attempted to secure legislation to provide for compulsory and binding arbitration. This year they have combined their efforts behind a single measure, SB 333.

Senator Dills' bill creates a separate class of safety employees under the Meyers-Milias-Brown Act and provides that, in the event of an impasse during the course of negotiations, the parties must submit to compulsory mediation, fact-finding, and compulsory and binding arbitration on the disputed items. The proposed law also states that fire fighters and police will not have the right to strike, recognize picket lines, or engage in a concerted stoppage of work, slowdown or interruption of services.

The Police Officers Research Association of California (PORAC) and the Federated Fire Fighters of California, AFL-CIO, contend that this legislation would not be necessary if local governments would bargain in good faith as the law now requires. When public agencies fail to bargain, they say, the strike is the employees' only recourse, even though it is an action held illegal by numerous court decisions. "When you strike, you lose public confidence and you've taken a backward step that can take five years to recover from," Charles Oates, a spokesman for PORAC, has stated. "We don't want to strike."

Nevertheless, since 1969, there have been strikes by public safety employees in San Diego, Vallejo, Anderson, Antioch, Hollister, Santa Barbara, Monterey, and most recently by firemen in Sacramento.

Both Oates and Ken Larsen, legislative representative for the fire fighters, are adamant that unless local governments are required to bargain with employees in good faith, strikes will not only continue, but will increase. They are convinced that compulsory and binding arbitration is the only mechanism to insure good faith negotiations by public employers. "The Meyers-Milias-Brown Act has not worked for safety employees," says Larson, "and we will not accept any compromise unless it contains binding arbitration."

The opposition to SB 333 is as adamant in its stand as the proponents. A spokesman for the League of California Cities, one of the opposition leaders, terms this measure "the single most important issue facing local government this year." Joining the league in an effort to defeat the bill are the County Supervisors Association of California, the California Chamber of Commerce, and the California Taxpayers Association.

The central contention of the opposition is that compulsory and binding arbitration will seriously erode the power of local government. Salaries and fringe benefits comprise the majority of the budget for most cities, and under the provisions of the Dills bill, an arbitrator could establish a finding which would require a substantial tax increase, leaving the legislative body no choice but to raise the taxes.

The League of California Cities has proposed a compromise covering all employees and providing for compulsory mediation, fact-finding, and a show-cause public hearing in the event either party should reject the fact-finding panel's recommendations.

Michigan's Experience

Whether or not compulsory and binding arbitration will reduce the number of strikes by public safety employees remains to be demonstrated. Michigan's one-year experience with a similar law, however, does suggest that strikes by safety employees will not end in California if SB 333 is enacted. Since Michigan's law has been on the books, the number of strikes by public safety personnel has increased, and, according to the Michigan Municipal League, less time is being spent in negotiation because compulsory and binding arbitration is now available. It is unclear, however, whether the Michigan experience is an example of growing pains or truly reflects a consistent pattern for public employee-employer labor relations.

In any case, it is doubtful that SB 333 will become law even if the Legislature approves the measure as it is now drafted. In a speech last month to the League of California Cities, Governor Reagan stated that " . . . the final decisions on how far government can go to meet employee needs and requests must be made by elected officials."

Whether or not binding and compulsory arbitration will be established in California this year, it will have a major impact on local government. It is a certainty that if the measure does not pass this year, next year will find police and firemen back in Sacramento and the tenor of their demands will be more militant than anything displayed to date.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Selected State Government Reports

EDUCATION

Voucher System for Education. Assembly Education Committee. 1970, 18 pages. Findings, recommendations, and dissenting opinions of committee members as chronicled at an interim hearing in San Jose on October 23, 1970.

Year-Round Operation of Public Schools. Assembly Education Committee. 1970, 7 pages. Findings and recommendations resulting from interim hearing, November 19, 1970, Los Angeles.

Inventory of Student Financial Aid Resources. California State Scholarship and Loan Commission, Rm. 1640, 714 P St., Sacramento 95814. April 1971. A statistical summary and analysis of the distribution of student aid resources among California's public and private institutions of higher education.

Administration of Tenure. Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure and Evaluation for the California Community Colleges, 1020 12th St., Sacramento 95814. April 1971, 13 pages and appendices. A report of proposed changes in policies and practices regarding tenure, faculty discipline and evaluation, by a committee representing all of the principal community college faculty organizations.

ENVIRONMENT

Coastline Crisis; by Bertram C. White. **Pacific Law Journal.** January 1971, pages 226-244. A review of contemporary examples of unchecked private and governmental development of the California coastal area citing instances where development has blocked public access to California beaches.

In the Interest of Earthquake Safety. Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, Berkeley 74720. 1971, 22 pages. A summary of findings and conclusions by members of the Task Force on Earthquake Hazard Reduction, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President.

Report on Electric Utility Research and Development in Areas of Aesthetic and Environmental Improvement. Public Utilities Commission, 350 McAllister St., San Francisco 94102. March 1971, 11 pages plus appendices. Includes results, findings and recommendations on: siting of new generating plants; routing of overhead transmission lines; and economic and technical feasibility of underground transmission lines.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

Drug Abuse Education. Assembly Education Committee. 1970, 19 pages. Findings and recommendations summarizing interim heaings on October 2 and 15, 1970, held in San Francisco and Riverside.

Issue: Aid to Strikers. State Social Welfare Board Position Statement. Department of Social Welfare, 744 P St., Sacramento 95814. May 1971, 12 pages with appendices. Presents three major board policy statements, including the boards determination that strikers should be denied welfare benefits.

JUDICIAL REFORM

Proceedings of the 1970 Institute for Juvenile Court Judges and Referees. Administrative Office of the Courts, 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco 94102. 1970, 171 pages. Proceedings of Institute held June 5-6, 1970 in Newport Beach.

Report of the Special Judicial Reform Committee. Los Angeles Superior Court, Los Angeles, Calif. 90012. Febuary 1971, various pagings. A comprehensive report recommending constitutional and legislative changes to streamline the administration of justice.

TAXATION

Final Report. Assembly Interim Committee on Revenue and Taxation. December 1970, 27 pages. Brief summaries of subjects covered in interim hearings including: financing city government; taxation and environmental policy; revenue needs of the state; taxation of banks; and taxation of intercorporate dividends.

Fiscal Implications of Environmental Control; by Pamela Pecarich. Assembly Interim Committee on Revenue and Taxation. December 1970, 119 pages. A study who should pay the costs for pollution control in the state, including an investigation of alternative tax policies which will have a positive environmental influence on future development.

Tax Reform in California — 1970 and Beyond; by Helen S. and George F. Break. Public Affairs Report, Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, Berkeley 94720. February 1971. Part 2 in a comprehensive study of 1970 tax reform programs.

MISCELLANEOUS

California Legislature Handbook. Office of the Chief Clerk, State Capitol. ($3.50) April 1971, 479 pages. Biographies and photographs of Senate and Assembly members, officers and staff. Available from Legislative Bill Room.

California State Information Sources Today; by Ruth Elwonger. California State Library, Government Publications Section, Sacramento 95814. 1971, 8 pages. A cataloguing of sources of state information.

The California Legislature; by Joseph A. Beek. Legislative Bill Room, State Capitol. ($2.10) Revised ed., 1970, 269 pages. A manual of legislative procedure, rules etc., with a section on the history of the California Legislature.

Califonia Legislature Handbook. Office of Chief Clerk, state Capitol. ($3.50) April 1971, 479 pages. Biographies and photographs of Senate and Assembly Members, officers and staff.

Unless otherwise indicated, reports may be obtained by writing the appropriate committee or agency, c/o State Capitol, Sacramento, California 95814. Orders payable by check or money order only.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CALIFORNIA CALENDAR

Meetings of the following state boards and commissions are listed each month; if one of these boards is not listed, it can be assumed that it is not scheduled to meet this month. Boards and commissions to be included are: Board of Corrections; Trustees of the California State Colleges; California Community Colleges Board of Governors; Coordinating Council for Higher Education; Board of Education; Highway Commission; Little Hoover Commission; Commission on Housing and Community Development; Lands Commission; Park and Recreation Commission; University of California Board of Regents; and Social Welfare Board.

June 10-11 **State Board of Education.** Auditorium, Resources Bldg., 1416 Ninth St., Sacramento. 9:00 a.m.

June 10-12 **Law Revision Commission.** State Bar Bldg., 1230 W. Third St., Los Angeles. 6/10—10:00 a.m.; 6/11-12—9:00 a.m.

June 11 **State Park and Recreation Commission.** City Recreation Bldg., Morro Bay. 9:00 a.m.

June 16 **California Community Colleges Board of Governors.** Hyatt Edgewater, Oakland. 9:00 a.m.

June 16-17 **California Highway Commission.** Public Works Bldg., 1020 N St., Sacramento. 10:00 a.m.

State Personnel Board. Rm. 113, 107 South Broadway, Los Angeles. 9:00 a.m.

June 17 **Commission of Housing and Community Development.** Rm. 3344, 1121 O St., Sacramento. 1:30 p.m.

Joint Committee on Educational Goals and Evaluation. Rm. 6028, State Capitol. 1:15-4:00 p.m. Subject: Review of guidelines for community participation in setting goals of education in California.

June 17-18 **University of California Board of Regents.** University Extension Center, Los Angeles.

June 18 **State Teachers Retirement System.** Rm. B109, State Bldg., San Diego. 9:00 a.m.

June 21-25 **State Board of Equalization.** Board of Equalization Headquarters, 333 E. Walnut St., Pasadena. 2:00 p.m.

June 23 **State Lands Commission.** State Capitol. 10:00 a.m.

June 24-25 **State Social Welfare Board.** Chico. 6/24 - 7:30 p.m.; 6/25 - 9:00 a.m.

July 6 **Coordinating Council for Higher Education.** Camellia Rm., Host of Sacramento, Sacramento Metropolitan Airport. 9:00 a.m.

The following boards and commissions follow a standard monthly schedule and thus are not included in the Calendar: Board of Agriculture, first Thursday of each month; Allocation Board, second Tuesday; San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, first and third Thursdays; Merit Award Board, second Wednesday; Public Works Board, last Monday; Reclamation Board, second and fourth Fridays; Soil Conservation Commission, fourth Tuesday; Transportation Board, first Thursday; California Water Commission, first Friday; and Water Resources Control Board, first and third Thursdays. Please contact the agency for meeting time and place.

PEOPLE IN THE NEWS

APPOINTED

Robert M. Baker, 33, as Assistant Deputy Director of the State Department of Parks and Recreation, by Director William Penn Mott Jr. Formerly Baker was Assistant Landscape Architect for the department.

Edward D. Ehlers, 38, as Deputy Director of the Department of Navigation and Ocean Development, by Governor Reagan. Ehlers has been serving as program development officer of the department's planning division.

Norman H. W. Jachens, 35, manager of an Oakland investments firm, as Chief of the Division of Housing and Community Development, by Governor Reagan.

Robert W. Karpe, 40, Bakersfield realtor and past president of the California Real Estate Association, as State Real Estate Commissioner, by Governor Reagan.

Frank A. Mesple, associate executive director of the California Municipal Utilities Association and formerly Governor Edmund G. Brown's Legislative Secretary, as legislative representative for the County of Sacramento.

Dr. Paul F. O'Rourke, former head of the State Office of Economic Opportunity under Governor Brown and consultant to the late U.S. Senator Robert F. Kennedy for health care programs in New York, as special Medi-Cal consultant to the California Senate.

Dr. Morris Rubin, 63, senior medical consultant for Medi-Cal in the Department of Health Care Services, as Chief Deputy Director of the department, by Director Earl W. Brian.

Col. Robert L. Vickers, 52, USAF (Ret.), as Deputy Director of the Office of Emergency Services (formerly the California Disaster Office), by Governor Reagan.

William S. Weber, 39, a management consultant with a major San Francisco firm, as Chief of the State Office of Transportation Planning and Research, by Governor Reagan.

ELECTED

Karl O. Drexel, superintendent of the Contra Costa Junior College District, as 1971-72 president of the California Junior College Association, an organization representing the state's 92 public and 4 private community colleges.

RESIGNED

Charles E. Dixon, 47, as Director of the Department of General Services, to accept a position as vice president with the Federal National Mortgage Association in Washington, D.C. Dixon, who was named director in 1970, previously served as deputy director in the Department of Finance.

Gilbert L. Sheffield, 41, as Director of the Department of Human Resources Development, to return to an executive position with Pacific Telephone Company in San Francisco. He has served as director since February, 1969.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOTING RECORDS

Y—Yes
N—No
*—Absent or Not Voting

SENATE

SB 79 (Nejedly) — Authorizes exclusion of portions of Solano, Napa, and Sonoma Counties from Bay Area Air Pollution Control District. Passed 23-7.

SB 150 (Dymally) — Deletes requirement that all proceedings at polls be conducted in English and repeals prohibition against election official speaking a language other than English. Passed 21-11.

SB 211 (Mills) — Authorizes local agency operating an airport to impose an airport privilege tax not exceeding 50 cents on passengers using facilities to depart. Passed 22-13.

SB 281 (Teale) — Provides for submission to voters at 1972 general election of a bond issue not exceeding $294 million for University of California health science facilities. Passed 24-9.

SB 439 (Beilenson) — Removes prohibition against women tending bar. Passed 30-2.

SB 461 (Kennick) — Authorizes juvenile court to dismiss case against minor before he reaches age of 21 if court finds that interests of justice and welfare of minor require such dismissal or if it finds that minor is not in need of treatment or rehabilitation. Passed 22-7.

SB 481 (Stiern) — Authorizes person who is registered voter and resident of affected school district to bring a civil action in order to compel performance of an act required by Education Code or to prohibit performance of act prohibited by code. Passed 22-10.

SB 504 (Lagomarsino) — Declares public policy favoring public use of private lands for recreational purposes without impairing rights of landowners. Passed 27-2.

SB 673 (Burgener) — Authorizes public school districts to establish, with approval of Superintendent of Public Instruction, year-round operation of schools. Passed 32-0.

SCR 66 (Alquist) — Requests the Public Utilities Commission to stop its staff rotation program and to return its personnel to the areas of their expertise and greatest effectiveness. Passed 24-2.

ASSEMBLY

AB 99 (Ryan) — Beginning in 1973, makes one legislative scholarship available in each state legislative district, for undergraduate higher education study. Passed 44-19.

AB 103 (Ketchum) — Places ACA 17, which provides that the proceedings of each house of the Legislature and the committees thereof shall be public to the extent provided by statute, on the 1972 ballot. Passed 54-6.

AB 152 (Crown) — Prohibits construction of Southern Crossing Bridge until the results of a special election in the counties of San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo, and Santa Clara are available. Passed 54-8.

AB 293 (Stull) — Revises procedure for dismissal of permanent school certificated employees. Requires dismissal procedure be conducted by hearing officer or professional competency panel. Passed 47-20.

AB 334 (Warren) — Lowers the age for serving as a juror from 21 to 18. Passed 44-21.

AB 341 (Russell) — Requires law enforcement agencies to notify school authorities of private school when teacher is arrested for certain narcotic offenses. Passed 45-18.

AB 428 (Beverly) — Permits exhibition of harmful matter to a minor who is employed by person exhibiting motion pictures, if the minor is actually engaged in such employment, and if minor's employment is consented to in writing by parent. Passed 42-16.

AB 440 (Cory) — Provides that vacancies on boards of supervisors may be filled by election if they occur more than one year prior to the next general election, rather than by appointment by the Governor. Passed 44-15.

AB 612 (Bagley) — Repeals Wakefield busing law of 1970. Previously failed (California Journal, April 1971, p. 118). Passed 41-27.

AB 623 (Meade) — Prohibits the use of prior convictions for the purpose of increasing sentences imposed for narcotics convictions. Failed 23-44.

AB 624 (Meade) — Prohibits imposing additional penalties on the basis of prior convictions for felony narcotics and restricted dangerous drug convictions if defendant was addicted to such drugs at the time of his present offense and if quantity of drugs in his possession was sufficient for his own use. Failed 12-43.

AB 627 (Sieroty) — Includes persons convicted of cultivating or harvesting marijuana under requirement of registration with city police department. Excludes from requirement persons convicted of a misdemeanor for possession of marijuana. Failed 28-33.

AB 628 (Sieroty) — Excludes psychological or physical conditions brought about solely through the voluntary administration of a narcotic or dangerous drug from the

Senate

Republicans — 19	SB 79	SB 150	SB 211	SB 281	SB 439	SB 461	SB 481	SB 504	SB 673	SCR 66
Behr	N	Y	Y	*	*	N	*	Y	Y	Y
Bradley	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	*
Burgener	*	*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	*
Carpenter	Y	*	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	*
Cologne	Y	N	N	N	*	*	N	Y	Y	Y
Coombs	Y	N	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y
Cusanovich	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Deukmejian	N	*	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	*
Grunsky	*	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	*
Harmer	*	N	*	N	*	N	Y	Y	*	*
Lagomarsino	Y	N	N	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	*
Marks	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	•	*	Y	Y
Marler	Y	N	*	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	*	Y
Nejedly	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Richardson	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	*	Y
Schrade	Y	•	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Stevens	*	N	Y	N	*	Y	Y	*	Y	Y
Way	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	•
Whetmore	Y	N	Y	N	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	N

Democrats — 20	SB 79	SB 150	SB 211	SB 281	SB 439	SB 461	SB 481	SB 504	SB 673	SCR 66
Alquist	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Beilenson	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	*	Y	Y
Carrell	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Collier	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	*	N	Y	Y	Y
Dills	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Dymally	*	Y	Y	*	*	Y	*	Y	Y	Y
Gregorio	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	N	Y	*
Holmdahl	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	*	Y	Y	Y	*
Kennick	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	Y
Mills	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y
Moscone	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	*	*	Y
Petris	N	Y	Y	*	Y	N	*	Y	*	Y
Rodda	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Short	N	Y	*	Y	Y	*	N	N	*	Y
Song	Y	Y	*	*	*	Y	*	*	Y	*
Stiern	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Teale	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y
Walsh	*	*	N	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	*
Wedworth	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y
Zenovich	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	*	

CORRECTION

The text on page 119 of the April issue describing the vote on AB 217 (Ralph) indicated that the bill passed 64-0. It should have said the bill passed 44-18. The table was correct, however.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

type of injury that hospitals and pharmacies must report to police. Passed 42-15.

AB 795 (Ralph) — Extends jurisdiction of Fair Employment Practices Commission to social clubs, charitable, fraternal, and educational associations not organized for profit. Passed 44-12.

AB 841 (Foran) — Allows payment of workmen's compensation benefits for an employee whose health or disability is caused or aggravated by an unreasonable refusal to submit to medical treatment. Passed 41-19.

AB 846 (Burton) — Repeals authorization of teacher to suspend, with good cause, any pupil for a period not to exceed one and a portion of a second school day. Passed 41-22.

AB 914 (Brown) — Provides that a minor brought before juvenile court may petition the court for the sealing of records any time after termination of court's jurisdiction over minor. Passed 47-21.

AB 931 (McAlister) — Permits unmarried persons living together as man and wife to obtain a marriage license without a health certificate. Passed 41-14.

AB 950 (Fong) — Exempts venereal disease instruction from prohibitions against requiring class attendance in sex education courses. Passed 51-11.

AB 988 (Cline) — Requires any person or organization granted the use of state college property for any commercial event to comply with all local ordinances of a city or county. Failed 35-31.

AB 1108 (Burton) — Makes it a misdemeanor for any person to manufacture, distribute, or sell toys depicting war or violence unless the toy is so labelled. Passed 41-23.

AB 1142 (Brathwaite) — Increases jurisdiction of small claims court from $300 to $500. Passed 46-6.

AB 1238 (Sieroty) — Requires allowance of credit against length of sentence or amount of fine imposed in case where person convicted of misdemeanor has been in custody. Passed 44-14.

AJR 21 (McAlister) — Memorializes the President not to suspend the Davis-Bacon Act, which requires laborers on all federal construction projects be paid the locally prevailing wage rates. Passed 41-13.

ASSEMBLY

Democrats — 43	AB 99	AB 103	AB 152	AB 293	AB 334	AB 341	AB 428	AB 440	AB 612	AB 623	AB 624	AB 627	AB 628	AB 795	AB 841	AB 846	AB 914	AB 931	AB 950	AB 988	AB 1108	AB 1142	AB 1238	AJR 21
Bee	*	Y	N	N	*	*	N	Y	N	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	*	Y
Brathwaite	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Brown	Y	*	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	*	*	N	Y	Y	*	Y
Burton	*	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	*	Y	Y	*	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	*	Y
Chacon	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	*
Cory	Y	*	Y	N	Y	N	*	Y	Y	N	*	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	N	Y	Y	*	Y
Crown	*	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	*	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	Y	*
Cullen	*	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	*	*
Davis	*	*	Y	N	*	Y	N	Y	Y	*	*	N	*	Y	Y	*	*	N	*	Y	*	N	N	Y
Deddeh	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Dunlap	*	Y	*	N	*	N	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	N	Y	*	Y	Y
Fenton	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fong	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	N	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	*	*
Foran	Y	*	N	*	N	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	N	*	*	Y	Y
Garcia	*	Y	*	Y	*	N	*	*	N	*	*	*	*	*	*	Y	Y	*	*	*	Y	*	*	*
Gonsalves	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	*	Y
Greene, B.	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	*
Greene, L.	Y	*	*	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	*	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y	N	N	*	Y	Y
Johnson, H.	*	Y	Y	N	*	N	Y	*	Y	*	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	*	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Karabian	Y	N	Y	*	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	Y	Y	*	*	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Keysor	Y	*	*	N	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	N	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y
Knox	*	N	Y	N	*	N	*	*	Y	*	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
LaCoste	Y	Y	*	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MacDonald	*	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	N	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y
McAlister	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
McCarthy	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	Y	Y
Meade	*	Y	Y	N	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Miller	Y	*	Y	N	Y	N	Y	*	Y	Y	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	*	Y	Y	*	*
Moretti	Y	*	Y	*	Y	*	*	Y	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	N	Y	Y	*	*	Y
Pierson	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	Y	Y
Porter	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	*	*	N	N	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Powers	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	N	*	Y	Y	Y	Y
Quimby	Y	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	Y	*	*	*	*	*	Y	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Ralph	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	Y	Y
Roberti	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	*	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	*	*	Y	Y
Ryan	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	N	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	*	Y	Y	*	*
Sieroty	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Thomas	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Townsend	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	*	Y	N	N	Y	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	Y	*	N	Y
Vasconcellos	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	*
Warren	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	N	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	Y	Y
Waxman	*	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	N	Y	*	Y	Y
Z'berg	Y	*	Y	*	Y	*	*	Y	*	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	Y	N	*	*	Y	Y

Republicans — 37	AB 99	AB 103	AB 152	AB 293	AB 334	AB 341	AB 428	AB 440	AB 612	AB 623	AB 624	AB 627	AB 628	AB 795	AB 841	AB 846	AB 914	AB 931	AB 950	AB 988	AB 1108	AB 1142	AB 1238	AJR 21
Arnett	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	*	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	*	N
Badham	N	Y	Y	*	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	*	N	*	*	*	*	Y	N	*	N	N	N
Bagley	*	*	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	Y	*	*	Y	*	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	*	*	*
Barnes	Y	*	*	*	Y	*	N	*	N	N	*	N	Y	N	N	*	*	Y	Y	*	*	*	*	Y
Belotti	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	*	N	*	*	N	Y	*	*	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
Beverly	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*
Biddle	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	*	Y	*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	*	Y	N	*	
Briggs	*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	*	N	N	N	Y	*	N	*	N	Y	N	Y	Y	*	Y	N
Burke	N	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	*	N	N
Campbell	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	*	*	N	*	N	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	*	
Chappie	Y	*	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	*	Y	N	Y	*	Y	Y	N	*	Y	*
Cline	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	Y	N	N	N	N	N	*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	*	N
Collier	Y	Y	*	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
Conrad	N	*	*	Y	N	Y	N	N	*	N	N	N	N	Y	N	*	Y	*	Y	*	Y	*	Y	N
Dent	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Duffy	*	*	*	Y	*	Y	N	Y	*	*	N	N	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	*	Y	Y	*
Hayden	N	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	*	N	N	N	N	*	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Hayes	N	*	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	N	*	N	N	N	*	N	Y	N	N	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Johnson, R.	Y	Y	*	Y	N	Y	*	*	N	N	*	*	*	N	N	*	Y	Y	N	N	*	Y	Y	*
Ketchum	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Lanterman	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	*	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Lewis	Y	*	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	*	Y	N	Y	*	N	Y	N	Y	Y	*
MacGillivray	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	*	N	N	N	N	N	*	*	*	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	Y
Maddy	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	*	N	N	*	*	Y	*	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	*	Y	*	*
Mobley	*	Y	*	*	*	Y	Y	N	N	*	N	*	N	N	*	N	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*
Monagan	Y	Y	N	Y	*	*	Y	*	*	*	N	*	*	*	*	*	Y	*	Y	*	N	*	*	N
Moorhead	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	*	N	N
Murphy	N	Y	Y	*	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Priolo	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	N	N	N	N	*	*	Y	Y	N	Y	*	*	Y	N	*	N
Russell	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	*
Schabarum	N	*	*	Y	N	Y	*	*	*	N	N	N	N	*	N	N	N	N	*	*	*	Y	Y	*
Seeley	N	*	*	*	*	Y	*	N	*	N	N	N	Y	*	N	Y	N	Y	*	*	Y	*	Y	N
Stacey	Y	*	*	*	*	Y	*	N	*	N	N	N	Y	*	N	N	N	Y	*	*	*	N	N	*
Stull	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	*	N	N	*	*	*	N	N	N	N	*	N	*	N	*	*	*
Wakefield	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	*	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	*	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Wilson	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	*	Y	*
Wood	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	*	N	*	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Land conservation will succeed only if and where man creates beautiful cities wherein he will feel it a privilege to be, live, and work.

– Paolo Soleri

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED